THE Nation

VOLUME 143 NEW YORK • SATURDAY • AUGUST 1, 1936 NUMBER 5

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 113

EDITORIALS:

THE SPANISH WORKERS SEE IT THROUGH 116

CYCLONE FENCE BY U. S. STEEL 117

EYEWASH IN KANSAS 117

HEARST AND LYDIA PINKHAM 118

WOOING THE NEGRO VOTE by Paul W. Ward 119

JOHN L. LEWIS: PORTRAIT OF A REALIST by Benjamin Stolberg 121

DEATH TAKES A HOLIDAY by Louis F. Gittler 124

TOWARD A SOCIALIZED MEDICINE by James Rorty 127

ISSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard 130

BROUN'S PAGE 131

BOOKS AND THE ARTS:

CHALLENGE TO ECONOMICS by Lewis Corey 132

FROM THE NORWEGIAN by Mark Van Doren 134

BLUEPRINTS FOR AN ECONOMY by Barbara Wootton 135

THE WORLD IN CELLULOID by Joseph Barnes 136

DESPAIR OVER THE CONSTITUTION by Louis B. Boudin 136

LITERARY CARTOONS by Samuel Sillen 138

ART by Walter Pach 138

DRAWINGS by Hugo Gellert and Georges Schreiber

Editors

FREDA KIRCHWEY JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

MAX LERNER

Associate Editors

MARGARET MARSHALL MAXWELL S. STEWART

DOROTHY VAN DOREN

Editorial Associates

HEYWOOD BROUN ALVIN JOHNSON

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Hugo Van Arx, Business Manager. Walter F. Grueninger, Circulation Manager. Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager.

The Shape of Things

*

THE LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLT ARE discussed in an editorial elsewhere in this issue. There is one sidelight that is worth special attention. That is the way in which the fascist rebellion against the democratic government of a friendly nation has been treated by the press. Ever since the February elections the Havas News Agency has been feeding the French papers with exaggerated tales about Spanish atrocities in order to frighten the middle-class vote away from the French popular front. The Hearst press took up the campaign in America and streamer headlines gave daily reports about the horrible acts of sacrilege perpetrated by the "Marxists." It takes no brilliant guessing to trace the connection between such reports and the Hearst attacks on the "socialist" and "godless" Mr. Roosevelt. Even the New York *Times* printed a front-page story on June 17 about thirty-six churches which were burned within forty-eight hours when actually not a single such incident took place in the whole of Spain during these two days. The reporting of the rebellion itself by the American press was so extreme that if it were not dealing with such tragic material it would be funny. Every morning the Madrid government fell afresh in the pages of the New York *American*. Most of H. R. Knickerbocker's reports which were featured by our yellow press came from the rebel headquarters while the official government dispatches from Madrid were buried on the inside pages and treated as dubious rumors. As soon as a garrison of soldiers declared itself in a state of rebellion, even our respectable newspapers and press associations announced whole provinces as having gone over to the rebels. We have rarely seen a more revealing example of wishful thinking.

*

AT ONE TIME THE STEP-CHILD OF ALL BUT THE most earnest political reformers, the civil service is now finding favor even in the eyes of the patronage boys. So sharp has been recent criticism of the spoils system, that it is doubtful if even the Postmaster General objected to President Roosevelt's recent executive order placing first-, second-, and third-class postmasters under competitive examination. This adds more than 13,000 to the civil-service rolls and removes that many jobs from the paternal partisan hand of Mr. Farley. The Republican National Committee has triumphantly announced, as a result of the President's action, that it was really Governor Landon's promise to remove the Post Office Department from politics

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which did the trick. Mr. Roosevelt may have been influenced by a Republican promise; he is even more likely to have been influenced by wide-spread and out-spoken criticism of patronage under the New Deal—some of it evidently deserved. But it is interesting to note that when postmasters were last placed under the civil service, it was by an executive order of Woodrow Wilson (Dem.) and when that order was rescinded it was by order of Warren Harding (Rep.). Moreover Mr. Roosevelt put strong Administration support behind a bill in the last session of Congress which would have provided by statute for competitive examination for these positions, thereby rendering executive orders unnecessary. The bill failed of passage by seven votes. The Democratic members of Congress voted for it three to one; a majority of the Republicans were opposed to it. Anyway, everybody loves the civil service now.

*

THE DEMOCRATS WHO TOOK A WALK WILL reach Detroit by August 7. There they will confer long enough to hearten each other and sing "Gott Strafe Roosevelt." Thus far the group boasts only the names of Ely, Colby, and Reed, but there are hopes of getting the ghost of Al Smith to walk once more. These Democrats will do their walking on a single plank, that of "constitutional government." Unfortunately there is one provision in the Constitution which will frustrate them. It deals with the electoral college.

*

NOT EVEN BAEDEKER IS SAFE FROM NAZI culture. A new edition of the famous guide book has been issued for Olympic visitors, with the tomb of Horst Wessel indicated as one of the important things to see and with the usual glorification of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi ideals. Our correspondent, Mr. Gittler, describes elsewhere in this issue the preparations for the games which are revivifying the buildings of Berlin, not to mention the manners of its inhabitants. Mr. Gittler left before National Laughter Week was proclaimed, during which Berliners were recommended to get their faces and their spirits in good smiling condition to greet the foreign visitors. In Hamburg the same sort of preparations accompanied the World Congress for Leisure and Recreation. *Der Führer* was proclaimed the savior of mankind; Strength Through Joy has been established as the national watchword; and the ideal of "better understanding and mutual respect among peoples" has been fully realized in Germany. (Jewish papers please copy.) It is interesting to note that although the American National Recreation Congress refused to send delegates to the meeting, a group of Americans went as individuals and took part in the festivities as heartily as Propaganda Minister Goebbels himself. Among them was Gustavus Kirby, treasurer of the American Olympics Committee. And when the American Olympic team landed, Avery Brundage, president of the committee, responded to the German greetings by saying: "Berlin has grasped the Olympic ideal as no other city since the days of ancient Greece." With the American officials, the campaign for *Gemütlichkeit* has evidently been a success.

IF DEAN RUSSELL OF TEACHERS COLLEGE spoke for Columbia University when he criticized the unionization of teachers before 600 of them at a summer-session conference the other day, we should very much like to know it. In effect he intimated that it would be quite too bad if teachers abandoned their position as a privileged "professional" class and stepped down into the ranks of organized labor. It might even destroy "democratic" control of education and place it in the hands of the "minority of people that belong to organized labor." This, he said, "would have interesting financial implications," for "a college or a private foundation has slender funds." The implications are clear enough—one of them being that the rich folk who subsidize so many of our educational institutions might withdraw their support if their "democratic" control by way of the purse-strings were challenged by organized teachers demanding better pay. The New York Teachers' Union has answered Dean Russell in a statement signed by its president, Charles J. Hendley, which boldly aligns the teachers where they belong and *are*—with the workers. The school teachers, says Mr. Hendley, "are on the average in a lower economic status than the industrial workers. . . . In the big school systems and in the big colleges they are regimented very much as factory workers are," punching time-clocks, arbitrarily hired and fired, subjected to summary cuts in salary and to the stretch-out system. What is needed for genuine democracy may be further unionization of the sort that Dean Russell fears so much.

*

THE PRESENTATION OF TRIPLETS TO A Russian gypsy tinsmith by a wife who had already borne him four children seems to fall in the category labelled by our esteemed contemporary, the *New Yorker,* "neatest trick of the week." For the triple birth enabled the grateful father to claim and receive the first of the cash awards for large families allowed by the White Russian Republic under the Soviet government's new law designed to promote an increase in the Russian population. Another section of the same law, as Louis Fischer pointed out in his recent articles in *The Nation,* was designed to prevent divorce by the simple means of making it prohibitive. It is working as effectively as Mr. Fischer predicted. According to a recent dispatch, divorces have fallen off 90 per cent in the twenty days since the law was imposed. This means, of course, as Mr. Fischer also explained, that divorce in Russia has become a privilege reserved for the higher-paid categories of Soviet workers. Which is only another way of saying that it is class-legislation. At any rate that is what such discrimination against those in the lower-income brackets is called when it is practiced by bourgeois governments.

*

IN NEW JERSEY WHERE THEY REALLY KNOW how to cope with the relief problem, a three-year-old child died of malnutrition the other day. The family had been subsisting on $5 every two weeks for five persons, and the little boy had taken to eating the paint off his crib. Accord-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ingly, although the case was recorded on the police blotter as malnutrition, St. Mary's Hospital in Hoboken listed the cause of death as lead poisoning. Meanwhile in Pennsylvania the political battle between a Democratic governor and a Republican legislature continues to block the issuance of relief allowances. After a long struggle over the size of the relief appropriation for the next six months, during which the legislature whittled $10,000,000 off Governor Earle's requested $55,000,000, the appropriation bill was finally passed. Relief stopped while the debate was going on; relief marchers laid siege to the capitol and threatened to remain until action was taken. But even the compromise produced only a temporary respite. On July 23 the Senate adjourned for a week, unable to reach an agreement with the House over the means of obtaining the necessary revenue. Bills to raise from $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 have been passed. The remainder was to have been obtained from increased liquor taxes, but the state liquor administration insists that all such taxes are already earmarked to meet tax-anticipation notes issued in 1935. While the deadlock holds, the unemployed continue to go hungry. Doubtless some irresponsible children will take to eating paint in Pennsylvania also. But as the chambers of commerce of every New Jersey city so aptly put it in reply to a question from the New York Board of Trade: "New Jersey had the courage to meet the relief problem in a sensible manner. . . . It broke the relief trust. . . . There is no starvation in New Jersey."

*

CHINA'S THREATENED CIVIL WAR, BROUGHT so near the bursting point, has fizzled out. Ostensibly anti-Japanese, the Cantonese uprising was really aimed not against Tokyo but against Nanking, for Canton has nursed a smoldering resentment against the central government ever since its establishment after the civil war of 1926-27. There seems little doubt now that the Japanese played upon this feeling and fostered the rebellion with loans, sales of munitions, and military advice. They did it because they wanted to hurry the disunity of China, to draw the focus of attention away from their own activities in the north, and finally to provide a pretext for stepping in and taking Fukien, the Manchuria of the south, which is already the field of Japanese political and economic penetration. It made little difference to Tokyo that the movement was proclaimed (and doubtless believed by many of its participants) to be against Japan. The risk that Chiang might join Canton against them they knew was negligible, but the chance that he might be forced into civil war against Canton was good, and one by which they stood to gain. As it happened they gambled and lost because Chiang did neither. The most slippery ruler of any country in the world today, he managed to avoid fighting either for or against, but brought about the collapse of the whole movement by judicious negotiation. Chiang's victory is for the moment a setback for Japan, but China may find it a boomerang. For Japan is in a hurry. She must strike while Europe is preoccupied. Thus the strengthening of China, brought about by the apparent unification of Canton with Nanking, may precipitate aggressive action from Japan.

IN NORTHERN EUROPE LABOR PARTIES ARE making gains. In the general elections in Finland on July 1 and 2, the Socialist Party won 5 more seats, giving it a total of 83 out of 200. In Sweden the Riksdag will be reelected in the middle of September. The Socialist Party, which has a paying membership of more than 340,000 out of a population of 6,200,000, lately resigned in favor of an agrarian Cabinet, but the coming elections are expected to restore it to office. At the elections of 1932, the party polled 1,040,689 out of 2,500,769 votes cast. The partial elections to the First Chamber, held in September, 1935, gave labor 102 seats out of 230 in the Lower House, and 65 out of 150 seats in the Upper House. Not less impressive is the progress of the Norwegian Labor Party, which puts the total of its paying membership at 122,000 in a population of 2,850,000. While the party now holds 69 seats out of 150, it hopes—as does the Swedish Socialist Party—to obtain a majority at the next general election, to be held in October. Denmark will hold a partial election to the Landsting in mid-September. Last October the party polled 759,000 out of 1,646,126 votes. This strong Socialist and labor front has borne fruit in the power of the Swedish cooperatives, now being studied, along with those of other Scandinavian countries, by an American commission headed by Jacob Baker, Assistant Works Progress Administrator at Washington. Preliminary reports of the commission's investigations indicate that the powerful cooperatives are actually busting the Swedish trusts. A third of the families of Sweden are members of cooperatives; manufacturing activities now yield to the Swedish societies an income of $45,000,000. The American cooperative movement, which is growing so fast, may well learn from Scandinavia the lesson of where its economic and political strength lies.

*

ONE OF THE FUNNY THINGS IS THAT WHEN there is a great deal of unemployment everybody begins to talk about how you can never get anyone to do any work. Miss Gertrude Stein is talking about unemployment in the *Saturday Evening Post*. She is talking about unemployment and how when you are having unemployment everybody who is out of work is becoming part of the unemployed. And when you are part of the unemployed you are part of that, and even the Indo-Chinese in Miss Stein's home town which is Paris won't work because they can get ten francs a day as unemployed. Miss Stein is saying that "once unemployment is recognized as unemployment and organized as unemployment nobody starts to work." So we are in unemployment living. We are in unemployment living we are now being having and gosh are we hungry! Maybe if we didn't recognize unemployment and organize unemployment people would just starve as they are or work for five francs a day. Everybody, like Miss Stein, "has to think about the unemployed getting to be that and is there any way to stop them. Everybody has to think about that." And maybe somebody ought to think about what Ben Stolberg calls lunatechnics being organized as lunatechnics and not recognized as lunatechnics and is there any way to stop that.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Spanish Workers See It Through

THROUGH the fog of conflicting reports from Spain it becomes increasingly clear that the fascist insurrection will not succeed. As we go to press, the left Republican government of Premier Giral is in control of Madrid, the administrative center, Barcelona, the largest industrial city, the cities of the metallurgical area around Bilbao, the whole of southern and central Spain. Navarre, with its Carlist peasantry, is the only district in which the rebels have received any enthusiastic popular support. Of the insurgent leaders General Goded has been captured in Catalonia, General San Jurjo has met death in an airplane crash, General Franco is outside the country, Calvo Sotelo could contribute to the fascist cause only by the dramatic incident of his assassination, and Gil Robles, who was never renowned for his courage, is following the news safely from the other side of the border. But the struggle is not over. The well-organized Moroccan army may yet leave destruction in its path, and the civil strife will probably be long drawn out, but barring military intervention on the part of foreign powers, Spanish democracy seems, for a time at least, safe.

"We are plentifully supplied with money," Colonel de Villaneuva, leader of the Pamplona insurgent column, assured a representative of the Associated Press on July 22. This serves to confirm what observers have suspected from the very start—that the rebel movement was not merely a military coup and that, as usual, money continues to furnish the sinews of fascist terrorism.

Where does the money for the Spanish fascists come from? Foremost among the contributors one must place the Jesuits whose banks line the main business street of Madrid. The Vatican has announced in its official organ, the *Osservatore Romano,* that it is neutral in the struggle. But reports about the activities of priests in Navarre, the most important fascist stronghold, are beginning to trickle through. When the left Republican government struck at the wealth of the clergy, deprived the teaching orders of their functions as educators of the young, and transformed convents and monasteries into public institutions, the church prepared for a counter attack. In October, 1934, during the uprising of the Asturian miners, the bishops blessed the terrifying Moors whom they sent into the northern hills to kill Spanish revolutionaries. Now the clergy are again using the army as a divine scourge to punish the masses whose pent-up rage has expressed itself in the burning of a few churches.

By the side of the bishops stand their natural allies, the great landowners, whom the agrarian reform had ousted from their hunting estates. Many of these grandees had long before the rebellion transferred all their fluid assets to foreign banks and were in a position to pay for arms. No government restrictions on the export of the peseta could impede the secret movement of their capital.

The third group are the Spanish industrialists. Spain is by no means a highly industrialized country and most of its progress in that respect has taken place since the World War. Nevertheless finance and manufacture play their role in the recent social convulsions. The industrialists have felt themselves threatened by the new tax plans of the government and by the adverse decisions of the labor board of arbitration. They had for weeks been prolonging strikes in order to produce the sense of disorder and anarchy which would cause the nation to cry out for a man on horseback. Against the rising movement of the peasants and the workers the Spanish industrialist is prepared to join hands with his former enemies in the church and nobility—and the hand he offers has money in it.

All three of these groups turned to the soldiers as their crusading representatives. In most European countries there exists an independent military force with a strong tradition of its own such as America has not yet quite developed. Men like Generals Franco and Goded have never made peace with the republic which placed them in an inferior social position, and they have never ceased to dream of the day when General Primo de Rivera was dictator by the grace of Alphonso XIII. There are many precedents in ancient history for discontented generals who, after sulking in the colonies, rebel and march on the capital to seize power. It is one of the weaknesses of the Spanish Republican government that it did not move resolutely to replace the anti-Republican officers.

These are the forces behind the threat of a fascist military dictatorship. The heroism with which that threat has been met will form a record that cannot be paralleled in the annals of the working classes of modern times. The popular front, which had shown signs of serious cleavage, held fast in a way that reveals an underlying unity among the rank and file despite the rifts in the leadership. Socialist and communist youth organizations had achieved a real unity before the revolt and were training themselves to repel just such a fascist attack as took place. At the moment of crisis the government passed out arms to the workers, and it was they who were decisive in crushing the uprisings in Madrid and Barcelona. The Spanish workers know that they are fighting for the cause of democracy everywhere, and they are determined to see it through.

It may be too early to talk of what will follow a government victory. The parallel of the Kerensky regime which was succeeded by a communist capture of power quite naturally comes to mind. But the Spanish experience has not followed the contemporary European examples in other respects and it may not in this respect either. A government which has been able to rally enough strength to check the revolt and which has been broad enough to include diverse progressive and republican elements may prove strong enough to continue in power. But the people must learn that the democratization of the army will be essential in preventing another military coup, and that safety for democracy in Spain lies increasingly in the direction of a worker's state. Meanwhile the picture of all the democratic forces of the country in arms and successfully defending themselves against the military fascism which crushed democracy in Italy, Germany, and Austria will be a dramatic example for popular fronts in days to come.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cyclone Fence by U. S. Steel

UNITED States Steel was sponsor for an advertisement in the July 27 issue of the magazine *Time* which may be regarded as a follow-up of the half-million-dollar broadside of the American Iron and Steel Institute of July 1. That broadside, since it was a political statement addressed not only to the workers but to the American people, was a verbal study in indirection. It began by indicating that steel's labor force was happily dismembered and its bones scattered in company unions; it ended by saying that "the steel industry will oppose any attempt to compel its employees to join a union or pay tribute for the right to work." The advertisement in *Time* employs instead of words an actual photograph whose import is both chilling and clear. It depicts two company policemen, with faces as hard as the steel they have sold themselves to defend, beating up a group of workingmen armed with sticks and stones. The immediate background is the classic fence that guards a steel mill from the world outside—a close mesh of steel several feet high and topped by strands of barbed wire. Beyond may be seen the outlines of those buildings where workers are not forced to "pay tribute for the right to work" in fiery furnaces but on the contrary are allowed freely to dedicate their skill and strength to creating the profits of the richest industry on earth. Ostensibly the photograph in *Time* advertises United States Steel's famous cyclone fence. In reality it is a brazen threat and a forecast of what will shortly happen in Homestead, Aliquippa, Duquesne, and Weirton if "outsiders" persist in the attempt to organize the steel workers.

On another page of this issue, Benjamin Stolberg in his study of John L. Lewis and the American labor movement, points out that a "social crisis begins when it becomes increasingly obvious to decent men that all the wrong is gathering on one side and all the right on the other." There can be no doubt that a social cyclone impends. There is no doubt either that United States Steel on its side of the fence is gathering all its strength. It is armed with money and guns; Alfred (Open-Shop) Landon is its white-haired boy. By high-paid publicity it is trying to discredit unionism in the eyes of the American public. In the mill towns, with true imperial instinct, it is trying to divide the ranks of its employees by means of "concessions"; in the political field such spokesmen for big industry as the New York *Herald Tribune* are doing their bit to set craft-union die-hards and industrial-union progressives at one another's throats. On the other side of the fence, labor, in its struggle for that mass unity which is its sole weapon, is fighting desperately against time, against the dividing tactics of employers, and especially now against the guerrilla warfare of craft-union leaders whose activities could scarcely please the steel trust more if they were bought and paid for. It is clear to the steel magnates, if not to the craft unionists, that Lewis's industrial unionism is a living force capable of undermining their great power. Hence their "concessions"—vacations with pay and payment for overtime—which, hollow as they are, have been the direct result of the overwhelming response in the steel mills to John L. Lewis's call to arms.

The battle lines are set. The public already knows in advance in whose fortifications the weapons of violence are stored. If it can also be taught its own best interests it will mass itself solidly on the labor side of the fence.

Eyewash in Kansas

THE Landon acceptance speech will not go down in American history as one of the great utterances of statesmanship. Despite the dutiful round of applause that greeted it in the editorial pages of the anti-Roosevelt newspapers (and that means some four-fifths of the press) it was a dull and inept affair. Radio listeners will attest that it made dreary listening, and in the cold print of the newspapers it makes even drearier reading. Strictly from a campaigning standpoint, the speech must be set down as a failure. It was common knowledge that Governor Landon had a bad radio voice, and whatever coaching he received from the broadcasting-company experts fell on barren soil. After a brave start in the first few paragraphs he fell back on mumbling and swallowing his words. But it was not merely that he lacked the magic of warm utterance or of memorable phrase. He lacked even more fatally something important to say. One got the picture of an insignificant, although sincere, state politician who had been taught how to speak his part, striving valiantly to cope with the demands of a national campaign and bewildered by the confusions of a vast economic system in a time of stress.

Most of the speech must be set down as eyewash for the citizenry. It has nothing to say about the issues on which the future of the nation depends—the nature of a workable social-security program, the techniques of adequate banking and currency control, the types of taxes on which the burden of governmental costs will be laid, public works and housing construction, the control of holding companies, the regulation of security issues, the relation of the government to giant power projects such as the T V A.

We are not calling for detailed statements on these subjects. But the American people have reason to demand at least an expression of general policy and emphasis. That it can be done is indicated by Governor Landon's position on the question of labor organization. He made it abundantly clear that his conception of collective bargaining for labor was that of the National Association of Manufacturers. He defined freedom to bargain as meaning freedom "of interference from any source"—that is, from the efforts of union organizers. Such "freedom" would mean inevitably a clear field for the spread of company unionism.

But if a similar clarity were extended and applied to the other phases of economic policy that we have mentioned it might frighten away the voters for whom the Republican leaders are panting. Hence the eyewash in the form of an appeal to Americanism, national unity, "common sense," "human freedom," and "constitutional gov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment." Hence also the attempt to straddle both lower taxes *and* adequate relief, business freedom *and* the enforcement of the anti-trust laws. We think of demagogues as violent and dynamic personalities, rousing their hearers to a fever pitch. There was nothing either violent or dynamic about Governor Landon. Nevertheless his speech was essentially that of the demagogue, for its appeal was entirely to the catchwords that have become traditional in American life and around which American emotions and prejudices have clustered. Whether it will be successful is quite another matter. Most of the realistic newspaper men in their off-the-record comment agreed that Landon had forfeited his chance of advancing his candidacy by making a clear and forceful statement of policy. Comparing the acceptance speeches of the two major candidates there can be no doubt that in the exchange of punts on the football field of the campaign Governor Landon has lost and President Roosevelt has gained considerable ground.

But Mr. Landon's failure is more than a personal failure. It represents the bankruptcy of Republican standpatism at a time when vast social and economic changes are going on and when governmental wisdom can lie only in control of those changes and adjustment to them. Governor Landon made it clear that he deplored what he calls "hysteria" and "class hatred" and that he loves all groups and all people. But love is not enough. It will not meet the needs of the relief rolls, nor will it protect the investor from security manipulators, nor will it keep the small business man from being crowded out by the concentrated power of the big corporations, nor will it grant any security to the aged and unemployed, nor will it wipe out slums, nor will it help the workers in the steel industry to organize for collective bargaining, nor will it keep a reactionary majority on the Supreme Court from blocking every effort toward social legislation and control of business. In the absence of any specific methods for implementing their love, Governor Landon and the Republican leaders can leave us only with the conclusion that they are not anxious to have any of these things accomplished.

But the absence of an affirmative policy of control does not mean the absence of forces and influences hammering away at our economic life. In fact, when the government withdraws, as Mr. Landon would have it withdraw, from a vigorous policy of control, it merely surrenders the power to those who have already seized it and it leaves the field open to the naked operation of all the forces at work in a closed capitalist economy. Let us make no mistake in thinking that the Republican leaders really put their faith in "nature's simple plan" and in the economic harmonies which will flow from the removal of governmental control. They, too, are aiming at control of our economic life. But the control they envisage is that of steel masters, oil kings, holding-company wizards, and corporation lawyers. It has become abundantly clear that Governor Landon, whatever may be the degree of his personal benevolence, has not the strength nor the stature to resist the pulls and pressures that these men will exert. An America under the Landon regime would be an America fashioned to their heart's desire. One needs no belief in "class prejudice" to understand that this cannot be the America of the majority.

Hearst and Lydia Pinkham

THE latest exposé of the patent-medicine racket has been given a rousing send-off by Mr. Hearst's *Drug World*. So hysterical have the editors of this trade paper become over the disclosures in "Facts and Frauds in Women's Hygiene" that they have rushed into print with the best unintentional publicity campaign the publishing industry has witnessed for some time. Two days before the book's publication date, *Drug World* sent special delivery letters to all manufacturers whose products it debunks, warning them of the impending blow. Naturally the medicine men hastened to buy the book, and the first printing was exhausted before publication. *Drug World,* however, was not satisfied with direct-mail advertising. Its editors proceeded to give the book wide publicity in their columns, even going so far as to build an editorial campaign upon it. They have urged manufacturers to organize a counter-attack, warning them that they are "in the same desperate position as the Allies occupied in that fated spring of 1918." The Proprietary Association, which favored the amended food-and-drug bill, and the Institute of Medicine Manufacturers, which opposed even this emasculated consumer legislation, have been advised to forget their differences and fight shoulder to shoulder against the common enemy. Exclusive statements by presidents of the medicine-men's associations which have been printed in *Drug World* are presumably the first blasts of the counter-attack. Frank Blair, president of the Proprietary Association, is of the opinion that "the claims made for the articles (proprietaries) in the long run must be truthful . . ." while D. E. Austin of the rival association feels "that the time is approaching when all advertising of drug products will be based on sound therapeutics."

Meanwhile, as might have been expected, sales of the book are soaring. This is all to the good, for its authors, Rachel Lynn Palmer and Dr. Sarah K. Greenberg, have done a competent and thorough job of exposing the frauds perpetrated on women who are too modest to discuss "intimate" problems with a doctor. This important subject has barely been touched upon in other consumers' books. Long before the days of Lydia Pinkham, the field of women's hygiene was highly lucrative for the quacks, but in recent years the profits gathered from the exploitation of women's weaknesses have touched new highs. An exposé of the dangerous products and dangerous methods sponsored by "reputable" manufacturers, as well as by others not so respectable, has long been needed and is most welcome now. "Facts and Frauds" is restrained, carefully documented, and convincing. These qualities, added to the debunking of such well advertised products as Zonite, Lysol, Midol, Hexin, to name a few, have probably caused the panic in the editorial offices of *Drug World*. Mr. Hearst has just cause for worry. A large part of the advertising revenue earned by his popular magazines is contributed by the Lydia Pinkham boys.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON WEEKLY

BY PAUL W. WARD

Wooing the Negro Vote

Washington, July 26

WITH unwonted fairness the front pages of the Ku Klux press on November 4 may scream: "Negroes Reelect Roosevelt President." There will be several grounds on which to base that assertion if Roosevelt wins by only a narrow margin. Chief among them is the fact that, technically, Negroes hold the balance of power in one or more states that Roosevelt must carry to renew his White House lease. The others involve the Democrats' elaborate and unprecedented efforts to woo the colored gentry away from the G.O.P. and the signs—already visible—that the Negroes are succumbing in large numbers to this political seduction.

It is easy to show why, of all the minority groups in the nation, the one of outstanding political importance at the moment is that one-and-a-half per cent splinter made up of native-born Negroes living in the North. One begins by pointing out that Roosevelt is certain to get at least 230 electoral votes. There is no space here to explain why that is so, but a glance at the list of states and their electoral ratings, coupled with even a modicum of political knowledge, will suffice to show its verity. Roosevelt will need, then, only 36 of the remaining 301 votes and, given the elements necessary to make the finish a tight one, he will have to get those votes from one or more of five northern states. Those states—New York, Michigan, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Ohio—form a block of 157 electoral votes. All five are normally Republican and, together, they have nearly 1,500,000 potential Negro voters—enough, if they desert the party of Lincoln for the party of the Solid South, to place all of these states in the Democratic column. Pennsylvania's thirty-six votes would be just enough to put Roosevelt across the finish line a winner. And Pennsylvania, where the margin of victory for either Roosevelt or Landon probably will not exceed 100,000 votes, has approximately 285,000 Negroes of voting age, or enough, if they shift, to wipe out the margin of 157,592 votes by which Hoover carried the state in 1932.

The picture is substantially the same in the four other key states with the exception that, unlike Pennsylvania, they plunked for Roosevelt in 1932. In Michigan, where Roosevelt's margin was 131,806, there are 118,000 potential Negro voters, most of whom were still voting for the Great Emancipator and the G.O.P. four years ago, and Michigan has 19 electoral votes. Ohio, where Roosevelt's margin was 74,016, has 206,000 potential Negro voters and 26 electoral votes. Illinois has 230,000 Negroes of voting age and 29 electoral votes. New York, whose capture by Roosevelt would give him 47 electoral votes and certain victory, has 293,000 potential Negro voters. There are at least four other states in which the vote of the colored brethren is important, and two of them are in the South, but all four seem already to be securely fixed in the Roosevelt column. One of these is Indiana, which has 14 electoral votes and 75,000 Negroes of voting age. Another is Missouri with 15 electoral votes and 152,000 potential Negro voters. The other two are Kentucky and Tennessee, so-called "border" states where for many years in certain sections Negroes have been permitted to vote not only in general elections but also in the far more important primaries.

With the strategical importance of the Negro vote in the campaign demonstrated, the next question is: How will that vote go? There is plenty of evidence of a heavy drift toward Roosevelt. Down in Louisville, which due to the Negro vote had had an almost unbroken string of Republican mayors and Congressmen since the Civil War, the colored people shifted their party affiliations in 1934 and presented the city with a Democratic mayor and a Democratic Congressman. The boss of Memphis also has discovered that they can be made to vote Democratic. In Chicago in 1934 they ousted the Negro Congressman, De Priest, a Republican, and put in his place another Negro, Mitchell, who is a Democrat. The North Carolina Democratic convention a few weeks ago seated a Negro delegate from Raleigh. At Durham in that same solidly Democratic state two Negro magistrates recently were elected, swept into office on their promise to be hard with landlords seeking eviction notices. If further examples of the trend be needed, there are the unprecedentedly heavy votes cast by Negro districts in the recent Democratic primaries in Ohio and Illinois.

Despite all this, the possibilities of error in gauging the drift of the Negro vote are enormous. It is easy to underestimate the grip which Republican machine bosses have upon the 1,500,000 potential Negro voters in the five key states. Only the members of the upper crust of the Negro community are to any appreciable degree political free agents. The rest do not vote; they are voted. Like his white brothers living in similar squalor in the industrial bowels and backwashes of cities, the Negro has been notoriously venal, placing his vote at the disposal of whichever machine at the moment can pay the highest price. The G.O.P. will have buying power again this year—bigger buying power, probably, than ever before—and all the factors which should make the Negro want to vote for Roosevelt must be discounted in the light of that fact.

There are, of course, a great many reasons why the Negro, if left to his personal predilections, should want to vote for Roosevelt. They begin with the fact that the Negro masses have never got anything in return for their allegiance to the G.O.P. Such favors as that party has dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tributed to Negroes when in power have gone to a few hacks with a coefficient of respect and actual leadership among Negroes about equal to that of Tom Heflin among the Boston Irish. The party has a better record than that of the Democrats on racial issues, but only on paper, and it has done nothing to improve its station in the past year. The agitation for anti-lynching legislation in the last Congress came chiefly from Democrats, and the one Presidential aspirant who ran into a barrage of organized Negro opposition was a Republican, Borah, who was condemned for his stand on anti-lynching legislation. At the party's recent national convention in Cleveland, it compounded all its recent errors with respect to the Negro vote by seating no colored delegates save those in the bought-and-paid-for black-and-tan delegations, which the veteran Perry Howard and the ineffable Tieless Joe Talbert brought up from South Carolina and Mississippi.

There will be time enough between now and November 3, however, for the Republicans to cover up most of those errors with new blandishments and dough. Their current lethargy springs only from a desire to keep their money bags as fat as possible as long as possible. They will spring into action in the black wards on September 1. When they do, it will be to talk not about their errors but about those of the Democrats. Professor Carpenter, the former Buffalo director of the League for Industrial Democracy, who is now a member of the G.O.P. "brain trust," began some weeks ago the preparation of a pamphlet on Senator Joe T. (for "Terror") Robinson, of Arkansas, and the relationship between this Administration leader and the frustration of all attempts to alleviate the plight of white and Negro sharecroppers in the cotton South. In this or similar handbooks for speakers, the G.O.P. will attempt to capitalize on the fact that the AAA's cotton program has pushed the southern Negro deeper into a slavery worse than that from which the Republican Party claims to have freed him in 1862. The Republicans also will seek to make Negro votes out of Roosevelt's silence on racial and civil-liberties issues as well as out of his Administration's failure to use its overwhelming majorities in House and Senate to force through an anti-lynching bill. They may also call attention to the refusal of the Department of Justice to send its G-men after lynchers who have kidnapped Negroes and carried them across state lines, as in the Claude Neal case, even after the Lindbergh law had been amended to make such federal action possible. And if the Republicans do seek to make that point against the Administration, which argued that there was no ransom involved in the Neal case, they can bulwark it by pointing out that there was no hesitancy in sending G-men into the Wendel case, though it also was uncomplicated by ransom demands.

Telling though such thrusts and arguments may be, how can they possibly prevail against the counter-evidence supplied by the Democrats in convention at Philadelphia? How can they possibly outweigh the spectacle put on there by Senator "Cotton Ed" Smith, of South Carolina, thunderously bolting the convention because of its courtesies to Negroes? Smith's blustering advertised to millions of Negro voters that one of their race, the Reverend Marshall Shepard, trusted political lieutenant of Pennsylvania's Governor Earle, had been invited to pray over the convention, that another Negro, Congressman Mitchell, had been allowed to second Roosevelt's nomination.

Coupled with the Smith incident as a vote-maker for Roosevelt is the performance of the Roosevelt-hater, Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, and his allies who with obvious defamatory intent circulated photographs of Mrs. Roosevelt in the company of Negroes. Then there is the case of Mrs. Roosevelt herself who, appalled by conditions at the National Industrial Training School for Girls, recently gave the inmates an outing on the White House lawn and by so doing provided the South Carolina Democratic convention a few weeks later with its chief topic of conversation. Speakers down from Washington were warned by friends on the scene to make no laudatory references to the President's wife; she had just entertained a bunch of "nigger whores" at the White House.

Not the least among the Democrats' assets is the Committee for Industrial Organization, parent to Labor's Non-Partisan League, which is out to line up the labor vote for Roosevelt. The unions which are the backbone of the C.I.O.—the United Mine Workers and the needle-trades groups—are preeminently the unions which draw no color line. There are about 100,000 Negroes in the C.I.O. unions. The U.M.W. alone has about 22,000 of them and by its example in Alabama has broken down the color line that for many years has been impeding unionization in the South. The C.I.O. in its steel, rubber, and automobile drives, has the active support of the National Negro Congress, headed by A. Philip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters. John P. Davis, national secretary of the congress, who was the pay-off man in the Negro division of the Hoover campaign in 1932, is taking an active part in the steel drive and has recruited for the C.I.O. eight Negro organizers.

And that brings us to the Democrats' chief asset in the campaign—the WPA. If there is anything at the Administration's command that will outweigh the cash the Landon forces are prepared to lay out for the Negro vote, it is the WPA. Unemployment has hit the Negro harder than any other group, and the WPA has given him work. Moreover, it has given him work on terms of equality with the white man. The opportunities for racial discrimination which the FERA offered and local relief machinery still offers have been virtually erased by the WPA's rules and regulations. Despite its flaws and its low standards of relief, the FERA provided thousands of Negroes with more security and a better standard of living than they had ever known before. The fact that this was due chiefly to the abominably low level of their previous existence does not alter the psychological effect. Nor does it detract materially from the fact that the WPA, while throwing back thousands of Negro families to their previous levels, has raised other thousands above the FERA level to a plane heretofore inaccessible to the colored masses. The FERA, it is generally conceded, was responsible for the Democratic gains among Negroes in the 1934 elections. Roosevelt and his aides count upon the WPA to double and treble those gains in 1936.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John L. Lewis: Portrait of a Realist

BY BENJAMIN STOLBERG

BIG business insists that capital and labor are really partners; which indeed they are. They are partners in revolutionary destiny. As yet, of the two, big business is by far the more active partner. Not that we have reached a revolutionary stage; not by a long shot. Not that big business has assumed the heroic role of the madness which destroys. But it seems to be rehearsing under good Marxian auspices, a lot better than our labor movement. It is mad enough today to precipitate a social crisis as we crawl out of the depression. It is forcing social war *just because* business is improving. Its madness lies in its failure to perceive that at this stage of American history such bourbonism is progressive education in class consciousness for the American worker. It fails to realize that between the Homestead lockout of July 1, 1892, and the Homestead memorial meeting of July 4, 1936, lie two generations of decreasing opportunity and increasing insecurity for the American people; that the frontier has closed and that within this enclosure the contradictions in our economy have been furiously at work.

Social crisis is a strong term. Are we in it? I believe we are. A crisis in capitalism differs from a depression in the business cycle in that the economic facts which cause depressions become a moral and finally unarbitrable issue. A social crisis begins when it becomes increasingly obvious to decent men that all the wrong is gathering on one side and all the right on the other, when the interests of big ownership and the interests of the nation become mutually exclusive. Then big ownership can no longer make concessions, its behavior increases in brutality, and above all, its lies become ever more transparent. Thus, the American Iron and Steel Institute felt itself impelled, through a sort of compulsive class neurosis, to advertise just such an egregious lie. On July 1, 1936, it spread this lie in a full-page advertisement in 375 of our leading newspapers at the cost of half a million dollars.

The lie was in the form of a syllogism. It had two premises and a conclusion. The major premise stated that "the overwhelming majority of the employees in the steel industry recently participated in annual elections under their own representation plan and elected their own representatives for collective bargaining." The minor premise stated that "no employee in the steel industry has to join any organization to get or hold a job." Their conclusion, therefore, was that "the steel industry will oppose any attempt to compel its employees to join a union or pay tribute for the right to work . . . [and] will use its resources to the best of its ability to protect its employees and their families from intimidation, coercion, and violence and to aid them in maintaining collective bargaining free from interference from any source."

In other words, a five-billion-dollar monopoly spent half a million dollars on a single lie which claims that labor is the enemy of labor; and that the friend of labor, its guardian, indeed its union, is the American Iron and Steel Institute. Marie Antoinette had more sense and decency than Eugene Grace! The Bourbons, unlike the House of Morgan, did not claim that they were the protectors of the *sansculottes*.

But this time, the bluff of the steel masters was called. It was called by John L. Lewis, whose drive and language they understand so well that it was indeed his leadership which frightened them into advertising their lie. David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corporation of America, whose workers have been on strike under Lewis's leader-

Mr. Lewis

ship, made a virtue of sound strategy and permitted him to address the nation on July 6 over N. B. C. on the issue of industrial unionism in general and the steel drive in particular. Mr. Sarnoff permitted Mr. Lewis to speak because it is obviously Lewis and not the American Iron and Steel Institute who speaks for labor and the steel industry. Lewis is chairman of the drive to unionize steel; he is chairman of the Committee for Industrial Organization which is back of the drive; and he is president of the United Mine Workers, whose resources are a guaranty that the C. I. O. means business. To call John Lewis an "outside agitator" in American labor makes exactly as much sense as calling President Roosevelt an outside administrator in American government.

Lewis showed in detail how the steel industry has "aided" labor for the past thirty-five years by failing to pay "a bare subsistence wage, not to mention a living

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wage, to the great mass of its workers." He showed the whole miserable history of the steel trust. He showed that when the steel industry speaks of "protecting" labor "it means that meetings of steel employees will be disrupted by thugs and hoodlums employed by the steel corporations; that the organizers themselves will be brutally beaten . . ."; and that the industry means to engage in "the unlawful, ruthless tactics of former years." Like Hitler, the Institute will protect its workers through terror. As though to prove how well Lewis knows these tactics, the Bethlehem Steel Company, whose president, Eugene Grace, is also chairman of the American Iron and Steel Institute, has hired, according to press dispatches, during the first ten days of this month 130 deputized gunmen. The entire steel industry is seeing to it that its controlled municipalities are laying in new supplies of tear and vomit gas, of ammunition and other riot material. Spies are being placed in the plants by the hundreds. Fences around these plants are being prepared for electrification. Terror is already reigning in the steel towns. And if in September or later we have civil war in steel, we know now who is preparing for it.

But John Lewis did more than give the lie to the steel outfit. He showed why the only way to organize the workers in a monolithic five-billion-dollar industry is through an equally monolithic unionism and not through craft-separatism. It is because he means to organize the basic industries into industrial unions that he has frightened President William Green and the other "pure-and-simple" labor bureaucrats on the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. into open sabotage. For obviously the amalgamation of the various crafts in one industry into a single union would lose a lot of trade-union leaders their jobs by the sheer elimination of these jobs. And equally obviously, the influx of large numbers of new workers into organized labor would endanger the tenure even of those reactionary job holders who would be left and who have come to look upon their jobs as their private property.

It is for this reason that the bureaucrats on the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. are doing their best to lop off the 1,250,000 workers in the C. I. O., almost 40 per cent of the entire membership of the A. F. of L. At this moment the council has decided to postpone the suspension of these unions on the plea of the Roosevelt Administration, which is desperately trying to prevent a split in labor during the campaign. But they want to suspend these twelve "dual" unions just the same. They mean to misinterpret the constitution of the A. F. of L. in such a way that these suspended unions will have no chance to vote on their own expulsion at the next convention of the federation in October, which requires a two-thirds vote to expel. The Executive Council is trying to kill the drive to organize steel as openly as is the American Iron and Steel Institute. It is the terror of the job holder which made William Green reply to Lewis in the public press in a scab speech. On July 7 Mr. Green issued a statement in which he "sincerely regretted that the C. I. O. thwarted [*sic*] the purposes of the A. F. of L. to inaugurate an organizing campaign in the steel industry behind which the A. F. of L. would have mobilized the united support of the pooled resources of organized labor." Thwarted when? What purposes?

In 1919 some fifteen crafts fought one another far harder than they fought the steel trust for their "jurisdictional" rights over workers they failed to organize, thereby losing the campaign before they started. In the great textile strike in 1929 in the South, Green promised the workers in the textile industry the "united support of organized labor"—a phrase he loves to mouth—and then managed to produce a mere $5,000 for the organization drive, the rest being furnished by individual unions without benefit of Mr. Green. When throughout the second half of 1933 Lewis begged Green to organize labor in the basic industries under Section 7-a, Green continuously sabotaged every effort—in rubber, in automobiles, in oil, in steel. When Gerard Swope, then in the government with Green, ironically suggested to him that the only way to organize the workers of the highly mechanized General Electric, of which Mr. Swope is the president, was to organize them on a vertical basis, Mr. Green explained to Mr. Swope why that was impossible. Indeed the complete collapse of Mr. Green in the NRA in face of the danger that labor might be effectively organized under Section 7-a made him the laughing stock of industrialists, government officials, and labor leaders.

And now this man has the gall to accuse John Lewis and the C. I. O. of "thwarting" *his* efforts to organize the steel workers. Does Green remember the conversation he had with Lewis on a cold winter midnight in front of the Cadillac Hotel in New York City, when Lewis plead with him to start an organization campaign in steel? "But, John," our hero of "the pooled resources of organized labor" wailed, "Where will we get the money?" And when Lewis showed him how to get the money to start, enumerated a half dozen international unions which would be glad to help, pledged him an initial hundred thousand dollars from the miners, Green sadly shook his head and walked through the revolving door of the Cadillac Hotel. Green believes in industrial unionism. But he dares not stand up against the Tobins and the Hutchesons and the Whartons and the Wolls on his Executive Council. No wonder Lewis once remarked of him: "I fear his threats as much as I believe his promises."

The difference between William Green and John L. Lewis is an exact measure of the growth and consciousness of organized labor during the depression. Green represents the archaic forces in American labor. Lewis represents its progressive drive. Fifteen years ago Lewis stood exactly where Green stands now, though never as a weakling. Nine years ago Lewis signed the Jacksonville Agreement in the bituminous field. Though it was a victory, it was a Pyrrhic victory. And when he realized that all victories are Pyrrhic unless they are backed by power, he moved to the left—rapidly since 1933—until today he stands at the head of an awakening labor movement.

II

The director of the C. I. O. is John Brophy, one of the truly noble characters in American labor. For years, as president of District 2 of the United Mine Workers and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

later, Brophy fought Lewis in the union. He lost. For Lewis had the power and he used it. The fight had been extremely bitter. Brophy represented the progressive forces in the union. His program was essentially the program for which Lewis is fighting now. Today the two men work together.

It was during the NRA that Lewis realized that the mass of American labor can never be organized along craft lines. And in the A. F. of L. convention in San Francisco in 1934, he came out for industrial unionism. It was due to his leadership that the convention authorized the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. to organize industrial unions in the automobile, aluminum, and cement industries, and also ordered the council to multiply the so-called federal trade and labor unions, which are industrial unions in individual plants, whose workers do not fall within the

Mr. Green

claims staked out by the various crafts. But throughout 1935, the Executive Council knifed this mandate and Green even secretly ordered his organizers to lay low on the industrial-union campaign. At the next convention, in Atlantic City in 1935, Lewis pressed the fight, and actually got over one-third of the convention to indorse industrial unionism on principle.

It was during this fight, from 1933 on, that John Lewis changed his whole philosophy of labor. For a struggle for industrial unionism necessarily involves a general progressive program. And so Lewis almost unwittingly found himself at the head of the progressive forces in the last convention, marching in the vanguard of all his former enemies. He forced Matthew Woll to resign from the acting presidency of the reactionary National Civic Federation. He stopped all the "red"-baiting, for now he needed the progressives in the various unions. And he even knocked down in cold blood William Hutcheson, president of the Carpenters, to keep Brother Hutcheson from playing a dirty parliamentary trick in order to keep the discussion of industrial unionism off the floor. In short, he accepted not only industrial unionism, but all the implications of a militant labor program. And with infinitely more power he found himself precisely where Brophy had been all these years. Out of the 1935 convention grew the Committee for Industrial Organization.

After the convention, Brophy went to Lewis and put himself at his disposal. John Brophy could do that without swallowing his pride, for his worst enemy knows that he would not work for anything in which he does not wholeheartedly believe.

"All right," said Lewis, "you be the director of the C. I. O." And there were no conditions.

I have known Brophy for some fifteen years. I have agreed with his position all that time. I have written a good deal against Lewis, incidentally never doubting his strength, ability, and integrity, but objecting to his dictatorial methods, his ruthless fight against his own progressive wing, his line-up with the rest of the bureaucrats on the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. before the NRA. And so, I, of course, wanted to gossip with John Brophy, not so much on how he felt about Lewis's program which had been his own all these years, but how he felt about Lewis now that he was in such close association with him.

"Naturally," Brophy said, "I would be with Lewis in this fight even if I did not like him; in fact, even if I did not trust him. His mere program is enough for me. But, you know, I am sold on Lewis today. He is simply marvelous to work with. After he put me in this job, he asked me, 'Well, John, who timed this thing right, you or I?' And I had to say, 'I guess *you* did, John.' And that's just it. Lewis has a genius for timing.

"Now the reason Lewis times so well," Brophy continued, "is that he is not moved by theory but by events. *His personality is felt in action.* He is entirely a pragmatist. But he doesn't compromise; he steps in. When he sees a chance he moves, quickly, decisively. He adopts and adapts and discards as the situation dictates, and he is so damned intelligent and fearless it is a pleasure to work with him. When he accepts a position, he accepts it in its entirety, not in bits. He accepts all its furthest implications. And to that degree, he is a good theorist. He understands these implications as a whole. For instance, there came up the problem of choosing my assistants in the C. I. O. I couldn't think of anyone to do the job except Lewis's former worst enemies. Such fellows as Adolph Germer and Powers Hapgood. So I went to him with my list.

" 'Is it necessary to have these fellows?' asked Lewis.

"Yes," I said, "first because I want people who know all about industrial unionism and secondly, I want people who believe in me personally.

" 'All right,' said Lewis, and approved."

Lewis holds no malice. He has messed up a lot of folks in his day, but that was only opposition.

III

John Lewis did not begin his leadership with any particular set of ideas or with an integrated set of ideals. The speech he made over a national hook-up in answer to the wilful misrepresentations of the American Iron and Steel Institute rang with a moral passion of which he would have been incapable ten years ago. And his testi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mony before a Senate Committee in 1935 in favor of the thirty-hour week expressed a rounded social attitude of which he had no conception fifteen years ago. Lewis moves purely realistically. His ideas derive entirely from the objective situation. He is quite right when he insists that he is not a revolutionary. He lacks the imagination of the true revolutionary. He is today a militant opportunist in the best sense. When he compromises he does so with reality and not with his own dread of it. He is primarily interested in the next step, but that step he takes clearly, definitely, ruthlessly, and always in the direction in which he wants to go.

John Lewis's people have been miners as far back as any record shows, and the record goes back for some three centuries. His father, Thomas Lewis, came from Wales and settled in Lucas, Iowa, where John was born on February 12, 1880. The father joined the Knights of Labor and worked in the mines. In 1890 he was active as a rank-and-filer in the foundation of the United Mine Workers and almost immediately got himself blacklisted in the entire coal industry for good, so that the Lewis boys had to go into the mines and support the family. In his youth John Lewis drifted into all sorts of mines all over the country—gold, copper, bituminous, anthracite. A start in life under such hard conditions may drive some highly gifted temperaments into an ineffectual idealism. But Lewis never had a touch of Eugene Debs in his makeup. He got toughened in the union local, often to be sure through means which a Debs would have eschewed. Lewis never moved without building and tightening his machine. He never hesitated to win first and be fair afterwards; or rather in a fight, he is fair to what he wants to achieve rather than to the person of his opponent. The fight with his enemies was often so extremely bitter that for years one heard about John Lewis having "sold out." There never was a word of truth in it. For one thing, he was brought up in the home of a blacklisted miner, and that left a deep mark on his whole psychology; and for another, John Lewis is interested in gathering power, not in selling it.

This does not mean that in the early days he rose to power by being drafted for his political high-mindedness. But he got there just the same. The fact is that in 1917 he became the first vice-president of the United Mine Workers of America. Fortunately for him, Frank Hayes, then president, was seldom sober. And Mr. Lewis was so busy filling his shoes that he could not be bothered sobering him up. Accordingly, in 1919 he became acting president. From the acting presidency to the actual presidency was but a step, for the miners do not elect their officers at the convention but by mail. And Lewis's organization out in the field saw to it that he got the right mail.

In the next article I will show how and what John Lewis learned from his experience as the head of our largest union, from his intimate knowledge of a basic industry, which is deeply affected by national politics and legislation; what he learned during the depression and from the NRA; and why he is today the most significant figure not only in American labor but in American life.

(Mr. Stolberg's second article on John L. Lewis will appear next week.)

Death Takes a Holiday

BY LOUIS F. GITTLER

Berlin, July 9

THREE weeks remain before the opening of the Olympic Games. Berlin is extraordinarily quiet and impatiently expectant. The streets are devoid of Brown Shirts and their leaders. There are no parades. Olympic banners and flags of all nations are flying about in the breeze, and the visitor is inclined to dismiss all anti-German thought and action abroad as insipid and unjust. He sees no Jewish heads being chopped off, or even roundly cudgeled. His popular conception of the aspect of post-revolution is shattered. The people smile, are polite, and sing with gusto in beer gardens. Board and lodging are good, cheap, and abundant, and no one is swindled by grasping hotel and shop proprietors. Everything is terrifyingly clean, and the visitor likes it all.

But few visitors will realize what the Olympics mean to Germany and to the Nazis. For three-and-one-half years the world has read innumerable books, articles, and other propaganda either for or against the Nazi regime. They have heard reliable speakers denounce the Nazis with all the venom and logical persuasion they could muster. And when the world comes to Germany to see the Olympic Games in August, it will be coming not merely to witness an international sports event but to pass judgment—no matter how little contemplated—on the practice of a political ideology. This the Nazis are keenly aware of, and the tremendous task of spreading good-will and justification of their own policy has been provided for with that remarkable insight and skill they possess in the arts of propaganda. The technique of influencing foreigners has been carefully perfected by a special committee within the framework of the Propaganda Ministry. This committee has maintained contact with German organizations and party cells in all parts of the world. It has received from these sources invaluable information and advice on the peculiarities of national reaction and the psychological attitudes toward the Third Reich. On the basis of its research and findings the committee has constructed a propaganda plan for the immediate purpose of impressing foreigners in Germany this summer.

The preparations for the Olympiad extend as far back as last summer. At that time public-works projects were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drawn up for the beautifying of the city. This specially concocted "beauty" campaign included the widening of streets, the rebuilding of public squares, the cleaning of all facades in the city by house-owners (failure meant a raising of taxes), construction of new government buildings, renovation of museums, and, most important, the construction of the huge Olympic Village which will later be turned over to the army. Even a subway is being built and is being rushed through double-time in order to be open for "Olympic guests" in August. The whole process is strikingly similar to that of the American provincial family's preparations for the town parson's visit. By order of no other than State Commissar Lippert himself, all bed wash has been ordered off proletarian balconies, no garbage is to be dumped in visible parts, spitting cherry pits or saliva on the sidewalks may be considered a major offense, and apartment house doors may be kept open until ten o'clock. All stray storm troopers have been told to ask questions first before pouring forth their hate in the presence of foreigners. Policemen are uncomfortably polite and prejudiced in favor of foreigners, although all the holy Prussian rules, regulations, and sacraments may have been trampled upon. Waiters, taxi-drivers, porters, bar-girls, and street-walkers are all learning English in groups in various cafés in the Westend. Smiles of greeting are being practiced; political sin is being erased from the conscience; laughter, gaiety, and good cheer are prescribed. The good impression must be maintained.

The *Stürmer* is now to be seen only in sections where no foreigner will wander. Gradually this vicious anti-Semitic paper has disappeared and the street boxes on every corner wherein it was exhibited have received a new coat of paint, hiding slogans calling upon the world to hate the Jews. Songs of wrath and thunder are sung no more and storm troopers, Hitler's bodyguards, Reichswehr conscripts, and labor camp youths are disciplined and respectable. The newspapers are filled with promises of the world's love for the "New Germany." There are interviews with representatives of all nationalities, sweet in sentiment and bubbling with enthusiasm. The German populace are instructed in daily editorials how to behave during the next month, and are warned not to bring their Fatherland to shame. Everywhere are to be seen the five rings of the Olympic flag. The Nazi party organ, the *Angriff*, is even running a serial novel advertised as the "pre-Olympia" novel, and entitled "The Sixth Ring," with Berlin and New York as the scenes of action and an international sporting love affair between an American youth and a German girl as its theme. Women wear brooches, bathing suits, hats, pocketbooks, all adorned with the Olympic emblem, and most males have discarded the inevitable Nazi insignia for the more attractive five rings. Ubiquitous is the Nazi slogan, "I summon the youth of the World," and the largest movie house in town released a film of the same name yesterday. The most important political events of the day have been ignored in the newspapers which devote most of their space to the Olympiad, the Arab discontent in Palestine, and the "riots" and strikes occurring so frequently in France, America, and Belgium.

Coincident with the "last appeal" to the world yesterday by Herr Lewald, President of the German Olympic Committee, was the meeting of the Reich Committee for Foreign Travel, a subsidiary of the Propaganda Ministry in Berlin. The gathering was addressed by State Secretary Funk, the right-hand man of Minister Goebbels, who described the Olympic and its subsequent flow of foreign visitors as calling forth the "fulfillment of a high political mission . . . and as presenting a propaganda opportunity which has never before in the history of the world been equalled." This "propaganda opportunity" will be penetratingly exploited, Herr Funk assures us. Ideas and directions have been thought out by the Special Committee of the Propaganda Ministry. While the

> Weimar regime would have been ashamed to show foreigners a wretched, badly-governed, degenerate Germany, it is the aspiration of the National Socialist regime to bring visitors here in the largest possible number. . . . In this we see effective defense measures against the lying reports about Germany rampant abroad. The foreigner who comes to us should see that under our leader, Adolf Hitler, a society has been formed into a united German people. . . . Every German hotelier, every German hotel employee, every servant, taxi-driver, represents the National Socialist state to the foreigner. Therefore, they all have the duty to behave themselves accordingly and not to shame their Fatherland. The foreigners who come to Germany must leave our country consciously aware that Germany is the most hospitable land in the world. . . . In the Olympic year 1936, each German compatriot is a host to the world. Each German compatriot must be conscious of this fact and act accordingly. Foreign travel is an instrument for the regaining of prestige in the eyes of the world. Foreign travel serves the Peace Idea, which Adolf Hitler, our leader, has proclaimed to the world . . . a lofty political mission, it is dependent upon each person what the world thinks about Germany and what the world says about Germany.

As a result of this important speech on Nazi Olympic policy, the *Angriff* published an editorial admonishing its comrade-readers to take notice that the "foreign travel bureau has done all in its power to entice the world to Berlin. Now it is up to you to supplement the German landscape with the amiability of the German people—so that we can effect the best impression possible."

Complete as may be this perversion of Olympic ideals to a huge propaganda network intended for the gullibility of foreigners, the Olympiad serves also a purpose at home. It is the great "economic hope," the great illusion that has been born again and is engulfing the merchants of Berlin and the Reich. Ask any business man how business is and he shrugs, then beams and says: "But when the Olympics come . . .!" A foreign newspaper dealer complains that hardly a foreigner was in Berlin this winter and spring, but, he adds, with a strange light in his eye, "when the Olympics finally come . . . !" For the past two months the Reich Food Ministry has been hoarding eggs and other foods which are not abundant in the Third Reich. Boarding houses, hotels, and most private families have already rationed out their floor space and are hopefully awaiting

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"the day." Even real-estate owners and agents assure one another that their ground is more valuable because it lies directly on the route toward the Olympic village. Many new restaurants and night clubs have been opened. If any evils exist in the economic structure, the Olympics will eradicate them. It seems that all the boredom of the Third Reich (even the parades are becoming boring) will find its terminus in the Olympiad. All life palpitates here because a two weeks' sports congress will convene in the summer. The Nazis have successfully cultivated the people's imagination and whipped it into a state of feverish hope. They have erected complicated information and guide bureaus, printed thousands of pamphlets, brochures, and books, manufactured artistic films glorifying sport, and have spent millions of marks in preparations, so that no inconveniences may be existent which might irritate Olympic guests. The rush toward the capital from the provinces commenced long ago, and the city government has been hard put to it to stem the tide.

In several weeks, the Olympics will be over. One hears stark, disconcerting rumors about what will happen after the bubble bursts. Thousands of foreigners will have returned to their homelands full of Munich beer, *Gemütlichkeit,* visions of pretty Kurfürstendamm women, buxom wenches, red-cheeked girls, and genial petty burghers singing in rathskellers and beer gardens. They will have seen order, contentment, clean-shaven storm troopers, labor camp youths, and disciplined Hitler boys. They will have taken part in the Great Farce and will retain vivid impressions of a creative, home-loving, foreigner-loving people, and will spread the gospel of "German peace" to the four corners of the globe. What will be the next step?

The rumors and stories told are disturbing. The Jews fear the consequences most. When the Olympics have failed to restore a shattered German economy, as fail they must, the Nazis are expected to hang all the blame on the Jewish head, and to claim that the "German Olympics" were ruined by Jewish propaganda abroad. There are whispers of confiscation of passports and papers so as to keep the Jews "prisoners" for the dirty work of the next war; of complete economic disfranchisement; of "sporadic" riots and pillaging. In Jewish circles the atmosphere is tense, and many of those who can leave will do so after the closing of the games. There is bitter resentment at the thought that the world may be taken in by the corruption of the Olympic idea to the personal propaganda instrument of the Messrs. Hitler and Goebbels.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Toward a Socialized Medicine

BY JAMES RORTY

VOLUNTARY health insurance, the increase of group practice, the expansion of public medicine as administered by federal, state, and local health departments—these are the chief aspects of the current revolutionary transition toward socialized medicine which is steadily developing. The nature of the lags and obstructions is also clear. Most important of these is the assertion, by the American Medical Association, acting essentially as a trade association of the one-man businesses which the majority of American doctors operate, of an obsolete title to the ownership and control of what should be an essential public service. The inevitable "community of interest" achieved through the indirect financing of A.M.A. activities by medical advertisers is also an important factor: the vested interests of the "little men" of medicine, of the A.M.A. as a commercially financed institution, and of the drug business, tend to coincide and reinforce each other. Together they pound the cork of scarcity economics into the American medicine bottle, which has been filled for us largely by the expenditure of social capital, public and philanthropic, in medical education and research.

Dr. Fishbein calls his cork "ethics," just as the vested interests of the power industry call their cork "liberty." Like the power fight, the struggle to socialize medicine is now in the open, with the arenas increasingly the press and the halls of legislation. And the "lay public," represented chiefly by the progressive physicians, many of whom have been excommunicated by the A.M.A. and by the social workers, public-health workers, sociologists, and economists who have occupied themselves with the problem, becomes now the protagonist of change. It is important, therefore, that laymen learn to see through the "ethical" and other shibboleths; also that they acquaint themselves with what is currently happening in the organization of medical care. The facts are readily available; among the best of the recent compendiums are I. S. Falk's "Security Against Sickness" and the pamphlet, "New Plans of Medical Service," issued by the Julius Rosenwald Fund of Chicago. The following greatly condensed description is based chiefly on these texts, plus a good deal of personal interviewing and correspondence. Today, in addition to the traditional, fee-for-service, sliding-scale practice of the individual doctor, we see developing the following types of medical service:

1. *The privately-owned group-practice unit.* The Mayo clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, is the outstanding example. It operates on a fee-for-service, sliding-scale basis, and on a very high scientific and ethical level which not even the A.M.A. has dared to challenge—in recent years at least. That the Mayo clinic has become a major institution of medical research and discovery, and is conducted primarily in the public interest, is due largely to the genius of the Mayo brothers. Every similar clinic has similar opportunities, afforded primarily by the large-scale, collective nature of the enterprise. But since control is ordinarily vested in a commercial partnership or corporation, the privately-owned clinic may also veer in the other direction: it may exploit both its employed doctors and its customer-patients, degrade the quality of medical care provided, and make little or no contribution to medical science.

2. *The group-practice unit which applies the periodic or group payment plan.* The Ross-Loos clinic in Los Angeles became perhaps the largest and most successful example of this type when, in 1929, the employees of the Department of Water and Power of Los Angeles sought and arranged for service on a group-payment basis. The medical services provided include house calls, office calls, diagnosis, and medical treatment; also surgical treatment of all kinds either at the clinic or in the hospital. There is no extra charge for eye refractions for subscribers, or for hospitalization. Employed members receive all services and supplies free except certain types of expensive medicines, such as insulin, salvarsan, or eye glasses. Dependents of members may receive all professional services, but are required to pay for their own hospitalization and for any supplies or apparatus used in their treatment, such as x-ray films, medicines, and orthopedic splints. There is also an extra charge to dependents of fifty cents for each office call and $1 for each home call, and other small charges for special procedures. The costs of services are $2 per employed person per month for the above benefits. The average extra charges for home calls, hospitalization, medicines, and so on, were sixty-eight cents per family per month during the year 1934, making a total cost of $2.68 for complete medical, surgical, and hospital care, not including dental service. In the autumn of 1935 there were approximately 20,000 employed subscribers representing more than sixty different groups of persons, constituting, with their families, more than 60,000 persons.

Three points deserve underlining: a. Group practice and group payment as operated by the Ross-Loos Medical group has resulted in giving the subscribing members more than the amount of medical care received by families of similar income in the general population. During the year 1933, there was an average of approximately fifteen office calls per average family of 3.02 persons, representing a subscriber and his dependents. b. The subscribers, whose hospital charges are included in the flat monthly rate use proportionately twice as much hospital care as do their dependents, whose bills must be paid directly. This may be interpreted to mean either that the subscribers tend to over-hospitalize themselves or that they tend for economic reasons to purchase less hospital care for their dependents than they should properly have; the latter inter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pretation probably comes closer to describing the actual condition. c. Collective representation as practiced by the enrolled groups serves both to reduce the costs of collection for the clinic, and to introduce some degree of control by the consumer of the standards and procedures adopted by the medical owners and managers of the clinic; it is not however, a true cooperative setup, since all residual profits go to the private owners.

3. *The cooperatively owned and managed group practice-group payment unit* which provides its members and their dependents with complete medical and dental service on a flat monthly or annual fee basis. The Farmers Union Cooperative Hospital Association of Elk City, Oklahoma, is an interesting example of this type. It was organized in 1929 by Dr. M. Shadid, who serves as medical director. The persons who join become stockholders in a non-profit cooperative association. A stockholder without dependents pays $12 per year; with one dependent the rate is $18; for a whole family, of whatever size, the rate is $25 per year. Payments must be made quarterly in advance. Participants in the health service benefits are limited to the families of stockholders, each of whom owns one share in the Community Hospital, erected in 1931 with bed capacity for thirty patients. The shares cost $50 each, payable $20 down and $15 a year for the next two years. The resources from shares are used only to pay for hospital land, buildings, and equipment. The stock is not assessible, but stockholders must pay for their shares in full when hospitalization is received. The hospital is managed by a board of five directors elected by the stockholders. The board employs a business manager for the hospital as well as the director of the medical staff. Extra charges to stockholders are made as follows: home calls, $1.50 plus twenty-five cents per mile one way; x-ray films (other than dental), $3 for one, $2 for each additional film. Membership has grown steadily, reaching 800 families in 1934 and 1,200 by the autumn of 1935. The medical and dental staff receives $12 of each $25 subscription with $13 being applied to hospital expenses. Fees from non-member patients go directly to the attending practitioners or to the hospital, respectively. All fees are assessed and collected by the business office of the hospital. Members of the medical staff receive one month's vacation annually, with full pay.

The distinguishing features of the Elk City enterprise are first, its cooperative organization—any financial surpluses are shared by the members; second, its inclusion of dental as well as medical service; third, its application of the insurance principle to average out both the sick and the well and large and small families; fourth, the development and support of a cooperative medical service as a department of the Farmers Union cooperative movement. This movement is well developed in Oklahoma, and derives much of its strength from the highly pertinent historical fact that Oklahoma was homesteaded in the nineties largely by trade-union and socialist workmen who found themselves boycotted following the collapse of the great strikes of that period. Before the war, the Socialists polled as high as thirty per cent of the Oklahoma electorate.

4. *Group hospitalization,* for the purpose of enabling employed persons and their dependents to budget systematically against the cost of hospital care alone—a limited group-payment plan. In February, 1933, the American Hospital Association officially indorsed group hospitalization as a method of budgeting hospital bills. This is a system of equal and regular payments (by an individual or family, usually in an employed group) into a common fund which will be used in providing hospital service when required. By February, 1936, more than 600 American communities had enrolled more than 300,000 subscribers in such plans, which involved the participation of several hundred hospitals. In New York, the three-cents-a-day plan of Associated Hospital Service had enrolled more than 80,000 subscribers after a year of operation. The annual cost of membership in the group hospitalization plan ranges from $5 to $12 per subscriber, depending upon the cost levels of the area, the kind of room accommodation received, the types of sickness covered, and the scope of the services offered. The subscriber may be admitted to any of the "participating" hospitals when necessary, but only under the care of a private physician selected by himself. The subscriber must pay his own physician's fee, but he may receive without charge as much as twenty-one days free care in the hospital, including the use of a semi-private room, nursing service, meals, the operating room, x-ray service, and laboratories. The hospital bill is paid from the central fund, which is administered by a non-profit corporation, the trustees of which may include hospital executives or trustees, representatives of industrial or civic bodies, members of the local medical society, the Community Chest, the health council, or the hospital council.

In 1934 the American College of Surgeons endorsed group hospitalization, but the American Medical Association has tried hard to put the brakes on this development. In October, 1933, the A.M.A.'s Bureau of Medical Economics issued a pamphlet entitled "Group Hospitalization Contracts Are Insurance Contracts," citing the opinions to this effect of the majority of the state insurance commissioners who replied to the A.M.A.'s questionnaire. Compliance with our various and complicated state insurance laws, most of which were written to protect the vested interests of private insurance companies, would tend to slow up and handicap this development, which has obvious advantages for the upper strata of employed workers and salaried people. It also has obvious advantages for the hospital, and Dr. Leland of the A.M.A.'s Bureau of Medical Economics points out quite correctly that the financial distress of the private hospitals since the depression largely accounts for their willingness to embrace group-hospitalization plans. There is also an economic advantage for the doctor, who has ordinarily a somewhat better chance of collecting his own bill if his patients' hospitalization expenses are covered by the payment of a monthly or annual fee. Fees paid to the hospitals are sometimes surprisingly high. For example, the Associated Hospital Service in New York pays $15 for the first day, $20 for the first two days, $23 for the first three days. Thereafter the charge is $6.50 per dav—which would ordinarily be considered a high rate.

5. *Industrial medical services.* In "Security Against

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sickness," I. S. Falk, summarizes this development as follows:

> In 1930, about 540,000 gainfully employed persons in the mining and lumber industries of twenty-one states were eligible to more or less complete medical care on a fixed, periodic-payment basis. About one-third of the Class 1 steam railroads have organized insurance plans for the medical care of their employees. And several million more employed persons are members of insurance groups which provide complete or partial medical service for these persons or for them and their dependents. In some places, these industrial medical services are financed entirely by industry; in others, costs are met entirely by the insured persons; but in most, both industry and the employed persons share the costs. . . . The arrangements through which the services are furnished to the insured persons are extremely diverse. In some insurance organizations, a hospital and its outpatient clinics may be owned by the non-profit insurance agency and physicians and other personnel furnish services on a salary basis. In others, the insurance group makes contracts for services to be rendered by local institutions and practitioners. In some, the operating contract may be a guaranty of payment for services rendered to insured persons according to an agreed fees schedule; in others, the contract may guarantee only such costs as exceed specified sums. . . .
>
> It may be estimated that all types of voluntary group payments for medical care through insurance, excepting that which operates under the workmen's-compensation laws, involve at least $40,000,000 a year. If this is added to the expenditures for medical care under the compensation laws ($80,000,000) we have in the aggregate about $120,000,000 (or more) a year spent through insurance plans.

As might be expected in such a diversity of plans, the quality of medical care offered by these industrial medical services runs all the way from excellent to wholly inadequate and even degraded systems set up to exploit workers under the guise of "welfare." Space is lacking to discuss the abuses which have arisen under the workmen's-compensation laws. Similar abuses have developed wherever unscrupulous medical or lay entrepreneurs have undertaken to sell policies to guarantee hospital service or both hospital and medical services. As Falk points out, "Some of these agencies have tended to bring the entire practice into disrepute because they have been patently dishonest schemes and have lately been prosecuted by the public authorities."

6. *Plans sponsored and operated by medical societies.* In June, 1935, the American Medical Society declared "its encouragement to local medical organizations to establish plans for the provision of adequate medical service for all of the people, adjusted to present economic conditions, by voluntary budgeting to meet the costs of illness." For some years previous to that decision several county medical societies in Washington and Oregon had been offering the services of their members to employed persons for an agreed annual payment. Free choice of doctors from among participating groups of from 30 to 300 physicians is provided. An extensive service is offered, covering medical, hospital, and nursing care both for injuries covered by workmen's-compensation acts and for ordinary sickness not connected with employment. The usual charge to subscribers runs from $1 to $2 per month. Special bureaus are set up by the county medical societies. While undoubtedly these systems offer certain benefits to both employed workers and the participating physicians, the demonstrated economies of group practice are largely ignored and unused, and the control is wholly in the hands of the doctors. Many of the medical-society plans, some in their formative state and others now in operation like that of the Medical Society of Wayne County, Michigan, of which Detroit is the chief city, are designed merely to "rationalize," through the setting up of a bureau to collect reduced fees on the installment plan, the administration of medical care to the poor. As Falk points out, "They do not secure the family against a future risk of sickness; they mortgage future earnings to pay for a calamity which has already occurred." The Wayne County plan was started in April, 1935. In the following November the two largest voluntary hospitals in Detroit withdrew from participation in the plan on the ground that patients were permitted to assume obligations beyond their capacity to pay. During the first year, the hospitals reported a default of nearly 50 per cent on the instalment payments of bureau patients. The hospitals alleged that in this way they were still required to provide charity service for "bureau patients," but were not permitted to use the facilities of their own admitting offices or social-service departments.

When reproached for obstructing progress in the organization of medical care, the A.M.A. makes a considerable pother about these medical-society plans, the inadequacy of which is apparent. Meanwhile, it tries earnestly but with less and less success to stamp out the grass fire of group clinics which its own members (they don't remain members very long) are steadily spreading. However, it must be admitted that our medical politicians are among our most effective political lobbyists. Their success in cutting health insurance out of the Security Act may be discounted; it was a temporary victory, and rather likely to backfire. But in Ohio, Illinois, and New York, the A.M.A. has procured the enactment of legislation which, when coupled with its power to excommunicate and otherwise penalize progressive doctors, is likely to delay and handicap the development of voluntary group practice and group-payment schemes considerably. In essence, these laws provide that the majority of the directors of all nonprofit hospital service corporations must be at all times directors or trustees of hospitals, and that the schedule of fees must be subject to the approval of the insurance commissioner. It may safely be predicted that this is not the only legislative joker that will explode in the faces of naive laymen and doctors who have been led to suppose that the A.M.A. has had a change of heart.

No, our medical Canute may be described today as wet but resolute. But the tide is certainly rising and neither boycotts nor legislative lobbying will stop it. The prognosis, if a layman may be permitted to use the word, is that the A.M.A. will be subjected to progressive immersion first in voluntary health insurance, then in compulsory health insurance, and ultimately in a fully socialized system of medical care.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THERE are two phases of the Spanish struggle that I wish specially to call attention to. One is the fact that the present round of fighting is only a round, no matter who wins it. The battle will go on until the Spanish workers and peasants have come into their own. If the present régime collapses, which may prove to be the case before these lines go into type, we shall undoubtedly see a terrific reaction with the usual concomitants of bloodshed, wholesale executions, concentration camps, and the like, and the establishment of a military dictatorship. The other is this fresh proof of the danger which comes to any republic from the existence of a large standing army.

Apparently the Spanish government has not had the strength either to put an end to sporadic lawlessness, notably against the Catholic church, or to take drastic measures with the army. When the king was driven out in 1931 thousands of officers were put upon the retired list or dismissed outright, but they have remained in Spain as foci of discontent and of hostility to those in power, and they are doubtless in entire sympathy with the uprising that began in the colonies and crossed over into Spain. It is beyond doubt a terrible situation, with all sorts of dire possibilities, such as the breaking up of the country into several parts. But the fact remains that this revolutionary outburst comes not from communists or other left-wing radicals, or from the land-hungry peasants, or the organized workers, but from the military men sworn to uphold the existing government.

The unrest which has marked these post-war years in Spain is the more striking because Spain was the only western European country to keep out of the World War, during which it prospered greatly. Much of that prosperity, if not all, has now been dissipated, in great measure because of the internal upheavals, but also because of those African colonies which, like Cuba and the Philippines in their day as Spanish possessions, have been such a drain upon the country's finances and manhood. The second article I wrote for *The Nation*, back in 1894, was a description of my visit to Melilla into which the Spanish army had then been driven by Moroccans. I was only ashore a short time, but what I saw of the conditions in the camps prepared me for the incapacity of the Spanish army to put down the insurrection in Cuba in the years 1896 to 1898. I have never forgotten the horrible insanitary conditions, the quality of the food served out to the troops, and the under-sized and pitiful Spanish boys who composed the rank and file and were being sacrificed in a war about the purposes of which they knew nothing. After the World War I met the German aunt of the King of Spain, a former Bavarian princess, who was then visiting with her daughter, the Princess Pilar, in Munich. I asked her about conditions in Spain and expected a rosy response. Her face fell. "I was so happy," said she, "that we kept out of the World War and even gained in prosperity by doing so, but now we are slaughtering our youth again in Africa. I wish I could understand these things, but I cannot. My nephew, the King, tells me that we must fight again in Africa because of our national honor, that we must hold those colonies come what may. I cannot understand it. I cannot understand," she repeated, "why this 'national honor' should make us butcher our youth in Africa and throw away all the money and the advantages that we gained from not going into the World War." Unfortunately it was the nephew who controlled and not this humane and kindly woman, and thousands of Spanish boys perished thereafter as well as thousands of Moroccans.

Certainly the colonies have revenged themselves once more upon the Spanish government. Perhaps the present rulers if they had had time would have decreased the army on African soil and sought to rule in accordance with the socialist spirit of good will and friendliness rather than by force of arms. If this administration in Spain goes down it will be simply due to the enmity among army officers for a new deal which was to have brought some hope and some economic satisfaction to the millions of underpaid and undernourished Spanish peasants and workers who have toiled for many generations for absentee landlords living in the greatest possible luxury in Madrid, or Seville, or abroad.

We have no definite statistics as to how far the redistribution of land has gone during the last twelve months. The very fact that it was under way undoubtedly goaded the reactionaries and the privileged classes to make a final stand against the expropriation of the great estates. If it is correct that the peasants are rising to help the rebellion it must be due to their ignorance of where their hope lies; they are surely forging new chains for themselves. I am afraid it is true that when popular revolutions take place it is absolutely essential to make them thorough. I do not mean by this that republicans and socialists and liberals should resort to violence, to mass murder and the concentration camps, but I do not see why they cannot use their power to grapple effectively with the reactionary elements to the extent of removing every last one from positions of importance, and if necessary using the right to exile. The trouble with the 1931 revolution, like that of 1918 in Germany, was that it stopped half way and did not carry out radical social and economic reforms. The present leftist-Republican Cabinet has only had five months in which to move, but one can do a great deal in five months if one will take a leaf out of the book of dictators and house-clean just as vigorously as they, only humanely.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BROUN'S PAGE

IT WAS a cowboy who called one of his associates a so-and-so. Under pressure by his fellows he agreed to apologize and said, "You're no so-and-so. Oh, no!" Father Coughlin seems to have followed a similar technique in regard to his burnt-toast letter to the White House. It was a somewhat grudging retraction of an epithet at best and now the prelate has taken to the stump again. According to a United Press dispatch from Buffalo: "The Reverend Charles E. Coughlin told 10,000 followers today, 'I have no apologies to offer the gentleman in the White House who lives on the rotten meat of broken promises.' "

But just how good are Coughlin's promises? It took him scarcely more than a week to break the pledge he took to abstain from intemperate speeches. And the President is only one man out of a multitude to whom the reverend ranter owes an explanation. It seems to me, for instance, that he owes a distinct apology to Old Doc Townsend and all the physician's followers. Booming "Priest" Charlie (since the lid seems to be off on the free coinage of epithets) went to Cleveland as one of the feature spellbinders. He certainly not only permitted but persuaded the revolving pensioners that he was heart and soul with them in their cause. His handpicked candidate, William Lemke, flatly announced himself as a convert to the Townsend plan, making only the slight and probably unnoticed reservation that the precise details would have to be ironed out by a congress composed of Union Party members and the Townsendite leaders themselves. When Gomer Smith told the delegates that the good father had previously referred to the Townsend scheme as "economic lunacy" he was shouted down as a prevaricator and a bearer of false tidings.

But in Buffalo, according to the same dispatch, Charlie under some pressure was forced to admit that he still believed the revolving pension plan to be "economic lunacy." His justification for his misrepresentations in Cleveland was simply that he and Dr. Townsend must fight together "to oust the New Deal from office." It may be that Charles E. Coughlin also deceived Gerald L. K. Smith. But even if that is so I would urge no apology upon the gentleman who is temporarily absent from his parish. If the priest can live by taking in the preacher, or vice-versa, I am quite satisfied provided the existence is a meager one.

Father Coughlin has mentioned Landon once or twice and even directed a mild and wholly polite rebuke toward Hearst, but it grows increasingly evident that during such passages Charlie winks the other eye. The radio ranter is most palpably playing politics. He is not sufficiently naïve to believe that Lemke can make a showing for himself. His whole intention in 1936 is to prove his nuisance value. It is entirely probable that Father Coughlin has no liking for Landon, even though he is trying his best to bring about his election. It would not surprise me to be told that Coughlin regards Townsend as a fool and Smith as a knave. Indeed I am quite ready to believe that he has a certain contempt for his own fuzzy followers and sees them as so much fascist fodder.

Coughlin has one faith and one alone. He has one favorite candidate and no other. He is pushing as rapidly as he can the political fortunes of a single individual. I may be wrong and so I should be reticent in bandying about the name of any good man. The most I am prepared to do is to hint in a sneaking way. My idea is that the proprietor of the Union Party is first and last and all the time for C--rl-s E. C---hl-n. If any considerable pressure comes from the Vatican I will wager $10 against an autographed photograph of William Lemke that Coughlin will shed his collar and coat as readily as he did at the Cleveland conclave. Although he pays occasional lip service to the creed and the customs of his church it is merely a coincidence that Coughlin is a priest. He most certainly is not functioning in this campaign as a Catholic. If he were there could hardly be so complete a tie-up between him and the Reverend Mr. Smith, the bullfrog kleagle from Louisiana's mud flats.

Gentle Gerald told a *Herald Tribune* reporter: "There have been rumors lately of a break between Dr. Townsend, Father Coughlin, and me. I want to tell you that after Father Coughlin spoke at the Cleveland convention, I took his hand and said, 'Reverend Coughlin, though we die, we are going on until our people have been freed,' and he replied, 'Though we die.' "

"Now I telephoned this afternoon," he continued, "and told him about these rumors of division of councils and he replied to me, 'Gerald, though we die.' That was enough for me."

And I think it's enough, too. In fact, I think it's too much. To Gerald L. K. Smith he may be "Reverend Coughlin." To Lemke he stand as, "Yes, boss, anything you say." But there is no reason why the average voter should make any allowance for the cloth of either Charlie or Gerald. Their function as clerics is merely an afterthought. In verbal encounters they should be prepared to be treated with the same consideration shown to the President of the United States—and no more. And so I say without any intention of any apology at any time that Booming Charlie is not garbed in holy orders, that he is not in any true sense a cleric of the Catholic church, and that he is solely a fascist faker using whatever means come to his hand to lend dignity and cover to his effort to achieve literal dictatorship in the United States.

What Charles E. Coughlin is really looking for is a large white horse and somebody to give him a boost into the saddle. When he clasped hands and said, "Gerald, though we die," he was moving quite close to one of his objectives. However, it is generally considered the wrong way to approach a horse.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

CHALLENGE TO ECONOMICS

BY LEWIS COREY

CAPITALIST economics has contributed little, if anything, to an understanding of the greatest depression in history. An economist here and there has made illuminating analyses of particular aspects of the problem, but these piecemeal analyses lack an inclusive theoretical and practical synthesis. The challenge of the economic crisis to capitalist economic theory has never been met. Nor is it met in what is perhaps the most pretentious effort to that end, the Brookings Institution's study on "The Distribution of Wealth and Income in Relation to Economic Progress," of which the fourth and final volume is now published.* Brookings brought to the task vast resources and the services of one of the most competent professional economists, Dr. Moulton; and that makes its failure all the more significant.

The problem is the inability of capitalism to use all its available forces of production and consumption. Brookings, therefore, devotes the first two volumes of its study to an investigation of unused productive capacity, and to consumption. According to "America's Capacity to Produce," there was, in the years 1922-29, an average unused capacity to produce goods and services of 22 per cent, and of 20 per cent in the most prosperous year 1929. (It was twice as great in the depression years 1933-34, and still greater in 1932.) According to "America's Capacity to Consume," the majority of our people during all the years of prosperity were living in poverty in the midst of unused capacity and consuming too little because of the lack of effective demand. This in turn involved an increasingly unequal distribution of the national income and the devotion of a constantly larger percentage of that income to investments. None of the Brookings conclusions is new, but the study provides a thorough statistical demonstration, especially of unused capacity. The two volumes are a definite contribution to quantitative economics.

The theoretical shortcomings of the study, however, appear clearly in the third volume, "The Formation of Capital," which attempts to give the "why" of unused capacity and deficient consumption and to provide support for the conclusions and proposals of the final volume. There is much acute criticism of orthodox economics in "The Formation of Capital," and its analysis of the role of commercial banking in the supply of investment capital is important. But it fails completely in its explanation of capitalist inability to use all the available forces of production and consumption.

For Dr. Moulton comes to the simple conclusion that since there exists an unused capacity to produce and unfulfilled desires to consume, all that is necessary is to let people consume more and put the unused capacity to use. As simple as all that! But is it possible under the relations of capitalist profit and accumulation? Dr. Moulton answers yes, and argues that periods of active consumption are precisely the periods of active capital formation, or accumulation. But the reverse is equally true: periods of active accumulation are (with rare but significant exceptions) periods of active consumption. The crucial problem is the relation of one to the other. Dr. Moulton insists on the priority of consumption, and concludes that capital-goods industries are not "the pivot around which the economic system moves." The exact opposite is the case, and the reasons may be thus briefly put:

1. Accumulation—the making of profits and their conversion into capital—is the economic law of motion of capitalist production.

2. Profits are converted into productive capital (upon which depend other forms of capital) by means of an increasing output and absorption of capital goods.

3. An increasing output of capital goods makes possible an increase in consumption by creating a strategic consumer purchasing power. Not one penny of the wages and salaries disbursed by capital-goods industries is spent on the output of those industries. They are all (except minor savings) spent on the output of consumers'-goods industries, whose enlarged activity in turn creates new purchasing power and consumption while the profits of that activity are transformed into new capital.

Purchasing power and consumption can increase only through economic expansion, and that expansion, as the history of capitalism makes clear, is determined by accumulation. But, and this is the basic contradiction of capitalist production, accumulation simultaneously limits consumption. Absolute expansion of markets is accompanied by relative limitation of markets, for it is the nature of capitalism to develop the productive forces of society beyond its profitable consuming power. This becomes involved with the existence of an unused capacity to produce—unused because its use is unprofitable—and with the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. The answer is still more accumulation: a still greater output of capital goods either in the form of labor-saving devices to cut costs (and raise profits) in old industries or of equipment for wholly new industries. Hence the increase in capital goods always outstrips the increase in consumers' goods. But this means that more capital and fewer workers are used in production; relative wages fall while capital claims and profits mount and absorb a larger share of the national income, diverting constantly more income to invest-

*"Income and Economic Progress." By Harold G. Moulton. The Brookings Institution. $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment than to consumption. Relative overproduction of capital becomes absolute, further productive investment is unprofitable, and limited accumulation limits the consumer purchasing power created by an increasing output of capital goods. A crisis of accumulation sets in as the demand for new capital goods begins to decline, economic activity moves downward, and society is thrown into the abyss of depression.

Recovery begins in the revival of demand for capital goods: unpostponable replacements and more efficient equipment to produce at lower costs for restricted markets, or, most important, equipment for new industries. That calls into being a strategic and profitable consumer purchasing power. Revival of consumption-goods industries, independent of capital-goods activity, can call into being only a purchasing power that is unprofitable and destructive of accumulation because its end-product is merely more consumption. This is the brutal mandate of capitalist accumulation: the existing equipment to produce goods and services cannot be more fully used until it is profitable to add to that equipment. If capital cannot accumulate, people cannot consume. Consumption is a by-product of accumulation.

Dr. Moulton's emphasis on consumption involves an abstraction of the existing economic system from its capitalist relations. This appears in his comparison of capitalist accumulation with the primitive production which is (as under socialism on a higher level) directly for use. But the capitalist relations of profit and accumulation develop an antagonism between value and use value: consumption is permissible only if production is profitable. The abstraction, moreover, makes Dr. Moulton consider accumulation as essentially the formation of productive capital; hence "surplus capital," that is, capital that cannot find investment in productive enterprise, becomes the devil of the piece. But that "surplus" is also an accumulation of capital; whether exported or "dissipated," as Dr. Moulton laments, in speculation, it means accumulation in the form of foreign capital claims or speculative profits. To distribute the "surplus" as income to consumers means a deduction from profits (or from earnings of higher salaried employees). Unused capacity may be called into use, but unprofitably, and accumulation and the rate of profit may move disastrously downward. "Surplus capital" is an aggravation of capitalist economic crisis, not its cause —which is accumulation itself.

The defects of Dr. Moulton's theory of accumulation are pitifully revealed in the conclusions and proposals of "Income and Economic Progress." For he offers merely another form of the theory underlying the "policy of high wages" (exploded during the 1920-30's); more consumption is the key to prosperity everlasting, for more consumption means more production, profits, and formation of capital. But Dr. Moulton rejects higher wages as contrary to the needs of profit. He urges "the method of expanding markets through a persistent reduction of prices as efficiency increases," and curiously forgets that this, too, may be contrary to the needs of profit. He laments that the policy of price reduction "has in considerable measure ceased to operate," and writes nos-

Detailed . Explicit . Scientifically Accurate

SOLD ONLY TO PHYSICIANS OR UPON A PHYSICIAN'S PRESCRIPTION

PARENTHOOD

Design or Accident?

A MANUAL OF

BIRTH CONTROL

By Michael Fielding, M. D.

Detailed . Explicit . Scientifically Accurate

PREFACE by H. G. WELLS

130,000 Copies Sold in England

At a time when so much pseudo-science upon the subject of birth control is being foisted upon the public, this book, by a recognized British authority, and highly endorsed by the medical profession here and abroad, is trebly valuable.

The leading medical publication of this country (The JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION) comments as follows on this volume:

CONTENTS

The Meaning of Birth Control
The Sociological Factor
The General Principles of Contraception
Methods of Contraception
Methods of the Future
Objections to Birth Control
The Propaganda of Birth Control
Birth-Control Clinics
The Birth-Control International Information Centre
O.K. Theory: A Survey of Fact and Fancy
Names and Addresses of Manufacturers and Retailers of Contraceptives
List of Birth-Control Clinics in the United States
Glossary
List of Books for Further Reading
Index

ILLUSTRATIONS

Female Organs of Generation (Fig. 1)
Female Organs of Generation (Fig. 2)
Foaming Jelly Double Tube with Bakelite Nozzle
"Dutch" Pessary
Cervical Cap
"Dutch" Pessary in Position
Cervical Cap in Position
Whirling Spray

"One of the best books on this subject that has yet appeared. The author has a thorough command of the subject and obviously has devoted much careful thought to the preparation of this volume. The subject matter is well arranged and it is presented with a degree of lucidity that may well serve as a model for other writers on medical subjects."

"The anatomical descriptions are lucid and the contraceptive methods sound and described so minutely that there can be no possibility of a mistake." —ST. BART'S HOSPITAL JOURNAL.

"It gives very clearly and completely, with all the decency of a scientific textbook, exactly what is clearly known and what is not clearly established about preventive methods . . . This is knowledge that I think every adult in a civilized community ought to possess . . .

"When the adult citizen has gone through these pages he or she will know exactly the physical factors of the modern sexual problem. He or she will have all the mastery of his or her sexual self that knowledge can give." —H. G. WELLS, *in the Preface to this volume.*

"The author is a medical man who has successfully performed a difficult task; he has written a book which satisfies the requirements both of the lay reader who seeks guidance in the conduct of the intimate affairs of his own life, and of the doctor who desires information on how to advise his patients. Of the many books written on the practical problems of birth control, this is likely to be the most serviceable to medical readers." —LANCET, London, England.

Sold Only to Physicians or upon a Physician's Prescription—If you are NOT a physician, this coupon MUST be accompanied by a physician's prescription.

Mail this coupon to:

N-8/1

The Vanguard Press, 424 Madison Avenue, New York City

Gentlemen: Please send me ..... copies of PARENTHOOD: Design or Accident? A Manual of BIRTH CONTROL, at $2.65 each *($2.50 for book plus 15 cents for postage and handling.)*

Signed .....M.D.

Address .....

City .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talgically of the 1870-90's when prices fell as efficiency rose. But that prevented neither the existence of unused capacity nor the coming of two catastrophic depressions. Moreover, the period's economic progress was determined by active accumulation resulting from mechanization of old industries and creation of new industries, not by the falling prices, which are to be regarded simply as an expression of the former.

In spite of sharp criticisms of many of its assumptions, Dr. Moulton accepts the logic of price economics which considers price the "regulator" of the productive system. But price must justify itself in terms of making profits and converting them into capital. Hence Dr. Moulton's proposal to abolish unused capacity by the simple method of lowering prices and increasing consumption is all too simple, for it may be unprofitable.

But if Dr. Moulton is right, and price reductions mean higher profits, what becomes of his proposal for more equal distribution of income to abolish unused capacity and prevent cyclical breakdowns? If profits rise, so does the concentration of income: we are back at the beginning, only worse. Dr. Moulton's cure is friendly to the disease.

Doubts, however, assail Dr. Moulton, for he says:

> Even if profits should not actually increase, a contribution is nevertheless being made through the expansion of wealth production toward raising the level of material well-being—which is the ultimate purpose of an economic system.

Again Dr. Moulton is guilty of abstracting the existing economic system from its capitalist relations. Where are the businessmen who will sacrifice profits to the material well-being of the people? Moreover, the existence of the system is involved: to release the abundance industry is now capable of creating would endanger profits and capitalism itself. The high development of the productive forces limits capital accumulation and strengthens the downward pressure on the rate of profit. This is the crisis of capitalism: the maturity of its economic development means decline and decay because it limits accumulation.

After his swing from liberal consumption economics to orthodox price economics, the eclectic Dr. Moulton swings to the "ideal" *laissez-faire* economics of the textbooks, and laments the interference of monopoly with the competitive price system—an interference which he considers "an abuse" of capitalism. Yet monopoly is a logical result of the earlier competitive capitalism; it was in the 1870-80's, when Dr. Moulton's prescription of falling prices was working, that monopoly arose to protect profits against the competitive price system.

The Brookings study is essentially unscientific in that it rejects the evolutionary approach by deliberately limiting itself to an "eternal" capitalism. Hence it does not analyze economic forces as they move beyond capitalism. It sees in monopoly, for example, merely a "deviation" instead of an evolutionary transformation, in its economic collectivism, toward the new order of socialism. There is not, moreover, a single reference to Marx, the one economist who offers a scientific answer to the present challenge to economics.

BOOKS

From the Norwegian

A FUGITIVE CROSSES HIS TRACKS. By Aksel Sandemose. With a Note by Sigrid Undset. Translated from the Norwegian by Eugene Gay-Tifft. Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

GUNNAR'S DAUGHTER. By Sigrid Undset. Translated from the Norwegian by Arthur G. Chater. Alfred A. Knopf. $2.

THE first of these novels is so continually bright as to be eventually dull. It labors with such brilliant success to avoid telling a story that by the four-hundredth page its most forgiving reader will be as ready as the author is to let the promised fable swing free of any further human attention. A Dane is supposed to be speaking, one Espen Arnakke of Jante, who murdered a man seventeen years ago and who begins by saying, "Now I shall tell everything." Such a situation has its obvious merits as material for fiction, but it soon appears that Espen is not to be obvious. Starting off with the credible theory that childhood is not a happy time for anyone, he devotes the majority of his pages to a demonstration of his own youthful misery in Jante, and implies that when we have heard all we shall know why he killed John Wakefield. Not that there is any direct connection between Jante and Wakefield, or between his childhood and the event he cannot forget. No, it is merely that life being what it is, at least for him, he had to beat Wakefield over the head—if that was the way he did him to death, for I think Sandemose is not clear on the point further than to remark how much blood the fellow had in him. There was a girl, it seems, named Eve, and Eve—but it was not jealousy, it was not revenge for Wakefield's having taken Eve away from him. Once he had thought so, but it was not anything as comprehensible as that. It was something indeed quite vast and vague, something as limitless as life itself, and a monologue of more than four hundred pages is necessary to bring order out of time's chaos.

The monologue, to repeat, is frequently very clever. It follows no subject longer than a page or two, and when it jumps to another one it is likely to jump far. It rides symbols like hobby-horses; nothing in Jante or elsewhere is ever quite what we should suppose it to have been, and Sandemose is undoubtedly efficient at finding something else for it to be. There is even a sort of fierceness about the way he sweats in every sentence to be intimate, abrupt, and startling, as if he were setting off firecrackers in our heads. Now and then they do go off, or at any rate this initial paragraph of a certain chapter went off for me—by itself, to be sure, since it had little bearing on the story:

> The horse is the most curious creature in the world. It is a great strong wildness lacking arms. Looking upon the horse when I was very young, I was moved to pity for such a huge block of flesh propped up on four posts, in such a way that it could do no more than move itself about. I was most bitterly anxious that the horse should have arms sprouting from its shoulders, and to this day I am still sensitive of this lack. Such a little shaver to have caught the idea of the centaur!

But many of Sandemose's bombs explode in his own hand when they explode at all. Nor do I find that he renders a significant or a convincing account of one man's childhood. This

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is partly because his purpose is so palpably to work up a case again Jante as the real murderer of John Wakefield, and partly because he obscures what he has to say with such a mist of tricks. Good novels are duller than this in those places where dulness has its contribution to make; and they are written by persons who have the humility always to be clear.

Sigrid Undset's foreword to "A Fugitive" praises it chiefly as a tract against the modern village, though she adds a phrase about its "genius and weird power." It has of course nothing like the power of even a slight tale like "Gunnar's Daughter," which takes its place among her minor works but shines there with a firm and natural light. As she tells the story of how the lovers, Vigdis and Viga-Ljot, destroyed each other in their pride she seems to be entirely ignorant that there are such things in writing as tricks. This happened, then that; and such and such things were said quite in the order imposed by impartial time. By the end, however, a definite and distinguished tragedy has taken shape and half a dozen persons have lived lives which were both individual and intelligible. How one tells such a story is probably not to be known except by those who can do it; and they do not talk to their readers. Sigrid Undset probably could not enumerate the measures she took to keep her feud from being squalid or her lovers from being pettish. Everything manages to be large in her story, no single word of which escapes from her hysterically or self-consciously. The reason must be that she is a novelist; that she is content to write in the tradition of novelists; and that what she has to say she knows how to say in terms of events which appear to have nothing whatever to do with herself.

MARK VAN DOREN

Blueprints for an Economy

THE MODERN ECONOMY IN ACTION. By Caroline F. Ware and Gardiner C. Means. Harcourt, Brace, and Company. $1.60.

THE central thesis of this book is that the old, automatic, self-adjusting competitive economy has given place to a new type of economic system, calling for analysis in totally different terms, and posing entirely new problems. Essentially, the impersonal rule of the market has given place to the highly personal rule of the administrator or business executive.

In consequence, instead of the agreeable harmonies of the economic textbooks we have a series of extremely ugly discords. Prices become inflexible, so that declining demand in any industry tends to be met, not by price reductions which expand the consumers' purchasing power, but by a curtailment of production programs. This, of course, means unemployment and further reduction of purchasing power, causing fresh shrinkage in wider and wider markets. Again, the pretty picture of the board of directors of a corporation directing the policy of the business so as to provide good profits for investors by good service to an ever-growing body of consumers looks a bit silly when one considers what are the real relations today between the humble stockholders and the management whose master that stockholder is supposed to be. And as for the smooth flow of saving into constructive capital creation, or the delicate gearing of international trade through a universal self-regulating gold standard—well, such a picture could be convincing today only to one who had never heard of the stock markets and had never attempted to buy, sell, or travel outside his own country.

Gradually, the main lines of this analysis are becoming familiar even to professional economists. It is, therefore, to the authors' proposals for remedies, rather than to their diagnosis, that the reader will look particularly for original thinking. Here the chief measures proposed are the regulation of monetary policy in the interests of price stabilization (alternative objectives, such as stability of consumers' money income are not discussed); the balancing of savings and investment by a program of public works and of payments to the unemployed, financed by loans; and the control of industrial policy by a mixed bag of measures such as extension of government ownership, or of government control without ownership, together with better representation of labor and consumer interests. To these are appended a rather hazily sketched plan for regulation of international trades, and an all-round scheme of social security. Few progressive economists will quarrel much with this. On two points, however, it does appear that the authors have walked quickly around a major difficulty.

The first relates to their optimism about the usefulness of strengthening the power of labor in industrial government, as a means of converting the present restrictive tendencies into expansionist policies. Of course, it is true that labor, *as a whole,* wants the industrial machine to work at full capacity with maximum employment. But in that respect the interest of labor *as a whole* and of employers *as a whole* are identical. Yet sections of employers are continually promoting restrictive schemes in their own industries. The reason is that in our type of economic system the sum of the parts is never equal to the whole. And this, in the last resort, is true of labor also. Ultimately the interest of every man is against that of his neighbor. Restrictive policies mean to the employer good prices and good profits at the expense of the public, and of all his own actual or potential competitors; and to the employed worker they offer an exactly similar chance—a relatively comfortable berth for himself, again at the expense of the public, and of his own

NOT

for the average reader but likely to be of especial interest to readers of "The Nation"

A novel which has been called "an autobiography of a soul," for it consists of a man's seeking in his own character and the experiences of his youth, for the psychological motives that impelled him to commit a murder. "It is almost as though one has stumbled across, for the first time, James Joyce's 'Ulysses'," says the *Book-of-the-Month Club News*. "A most unusual book: sensitive, powerful, a sort of 'Main Street' covering the world . . . done with beauty and meaning," says *Louis Adamic*. "A novel of genuine originality . . . a highly original mind at work," writes *Louis Kronenberger* (in the *New York Times*). $2.50

A Fugitive Crosses His Tracks

By AKSEL SANDEMOSE

A Borzoi Book published by Alfred A. Knopf

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out-of-work comrade. This, which I have elsewhere described as the "centrifugal" force of all capitalist society, may just as likely be aggravated as moderated by the explicit representation of labor interests in the making of industrial policy.

The second point at which fundamental issues appear to be evaded is in the chapter on the necessity of a general economic planning. The dangers of sectional planning, as being likely often to make things worse rather than better, are properly emphasized. But the measures by which it is hoped to make a real general plan effective (that is, a plan which would attempt to estimate consumers' needs on the one hand as against the resources available for satisfying those needs on the other) look weak indeed beside the sectional interests that must be arrayed against anything of the kind. Inevitably, it is to the American farmer's interest to make food scarce and dear, although any general plan would immediately show that a large proportion of the American public do not eat enough to keep themselves well. The only really powerful instrument that our authors suggest for bridging this gulf of interest is payment of subsidies—which, when made general, opens up a truly alarming prospect. The implicit fundamental issue, whether general planning can have any meaning apart from from general socialization, is not so much as posed anywhere. When all is said, however, the Means-Ware analysis deserves to find a wide public and if at points the authors have not done more than spur themselves and others to fresh thinking, in view of the difficulty of the task in hand, we still have reason enough to be grateful. BARBARA WOOTTON

The World in Celluloid

TWO WORLDS. By Lester Cohen. Covici-Friede. $3.50.

THERE is in this book, as there has been in half a dozen American motion pictures, an almost frightening forevision of what lies in store for the world when Hollywood forsakes love and goes in for life. Mr. Cohen left a scenarist's office in Hollywood, he explains, to seek "the beauty and the wonder of the world." He knew little "of the millions of people on this earth, living in the many countries, languishing or flourishing in the different cultures, civilizations, economic systems."

His search for the world took him completely around it, and ended in the conviction that he had seen two worlds—communism and capitalism. Everything he saw was geared one way or the other, the old lines were gone, and everyone belonged to one or the other of these two worlds. But the racing account he has given of his search, told entirely in the present tense with pace and gusto, states this theme only in its final paragraph. The rest of it is as impersonal, as undeliberate, as entertaining, as the diary of a man who has been on a long roller-coaster ride.

The book is quick and easy reading; it is itself a motion picture. It has the casting director's unerring eye for type. It has fine, unblurred focus on the faces of things and people except, as in a film, when a transition requires the running dissolve with the images made dim and fuzzy. It has sex—in Paris and Cairo, Jericho and Jerusalem, Mr. Cohen investigated the local night life in the purified spirit of good, clean fun to which Mr. Hays has converted the motion-picture industry.

More important, Mr. Cohen writes with the same strange naivete, the same child-like objectivity of the motion pictures. It is reporting so naked that much of it is without meaning. The author tries to be fair by being guileless, and lack of guile, when the world and war and revolution are concerned, can be simulated most easily by lack of knowledge.

So Mr. Cohen asked a pilgrim from Damascus if Egypt administered the Sudan. No, he was told, England did. Well, if the Egyptians ruled the Sudan, would they be any happier? Yes, said the Egyptian, they would. And so it goes. Through the Soviet Union, through Jerusalem and the Near East, through India, China, and Japan, Mr. Cohen traveled with a camera eye. Not once does he stop in his story of the trip to suggest that this is life he is describing, something important to the people who live it and, most of all, to himself. It is a travelogue through ideas and people instead of statues and scenery, but it remains faithful, even to the occasional wisecracks, to the traditions of the travelogue.

Cameramen who are most precise and painstaking with their foregrounds blur what lies behind to sharpen the etched quality of the camera focus. In "Two Worlds" a sort of synthetic history of the world serves to fill in the dimensions which the foreground lacks.

"Ah, once it was Merrie England," Mr. Cohen writes, "and its wenches were Nell and Becky and Moll, and its men raised hell at Runnymede and whacked out a Bill of Rights and beheaded kings and kicked out parliaments and sailed the unknown seas and conquered new domains and made the greatest drama since Greece and the greatest poetry the world has ever known, and in little London town, on the seat of fire and plague, made an octopus-empire, with tentacles flapping out over the globe, holding the far peoples fast and conquering them with fire and the sword and making them dig up and give over the wealth and spice of their land . . .".

It is at least something for a successful writer from Hollywood to have discovered that it is no longer Merrie England. Mr. Cohen did more. He went back to a little town near Minsk and talked to his father's cousins about life in a new society. Everywhere he went, he noticed faces and smells and ideas and, most of all, sounds. Phrases in pidgin English come alive on his pages like faces in a well-directed Hollywood mob scene. It may be asking for the moon to wish that, unlike the motion pictures, he had named the meaning to himself of the things he saw and heard, or hinted that some of them may have bent or changed the camera lens itself. JOSEPH BARNES

Despair over the Constitution

WHOSE CONSTITUTION? By Henry A. Wallace. Reynal and Hitchcock. $1.75.

STORM OVER THE CONSTITUTION. By Irving Brant. With an introduction by Henry A. Wallace. Bobbs-Merrill. $2.

SECRETARY WALLACE'S is a very human book. It exudes warmth and good-will toward all men, and a special sympathy for the small man and the underdog. This sympathy is very genuine and has an engaging quality which captures the reader and carries him along. Common sense also abounds which should have a great appeal to the "general reader" for whom the book is intended. If the book contained nothing else, only praise should be its meed, but unfortunately it has larger pretensions, with the result that its merits are largely offset, if not entirely nullified, by its very grave defects. Mr. Wallace discourses at large on economics, constitutional law, and history, with a Sermon on the Mount thrown in, but the only qualification he brings to the task is that of a preacher. He is neither economist, jurist, nor historian.

The question contained in the title is never answered, or at least not in any meaningful way. And the more important question, what to do about the Constitution, is answered in a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way that cannot but be injurious to the people whose cause Mr. Wallace undertakes to plead. He shows how the Constitution has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to aid in the domination of the people by large aggregations of capital. But this only leads him to the remarkable conclusion that the people cannot, and *ought not,* do anything about it except hope for the appointment of liberal Supreme Court justices by good presidents—surely a disheartening conclusion for those who have been undergoing untold suffering during the last few years. Of course, had Mr. Wallace's conclusions been based on sound facts and logical argumentation the bitter truth would be better than the raising of false hopes. But he reaches his conclusions by way of fallacious arguments based on false premises.

It is impossible here to discuss all the bad economics, jurisprudence, and history stated, or tacitly assumed, in the book. A few examples must suffice. The author's history is quite at fault when he says:

> It is true that the commercial classes, under the new constitution, got the jump on the agriculturists in obtaining powers from the government. Interpreted liberally, the clauses that allowed Congress to lay duties and to regulate foreign and interstate commerce were to become the grounds for the protective tariff. Freedom of capital enterprise to expand indefinitely was to be facilitated by the protection of property rights under various provisions, even the interstate commerce clause.

This is almost the exact reverse of historical truth. Such gains as accrued to the "commercial classes" were not due to anything contained in the Constitution itself by way of special protection of property rights, but from the mere fact of the formation of the "more perfect union" which of necessity turned over the regulation of commerce to the national government. Nor is it true that the Constitution contains "various provisions" for the protection of property rights. The only such provision was the clause against "the impairment of obligation of contracts," which was only a curb upon state action and instead of "facilitating" the expansion of capital enterprise, actually hampers it, as I have had occasion to prove elsewhere.

Turning from history to economics one is at a loss to discover Mr. Wallace's views on the basic problems of economics. Like all "moderates," though he has much to say on both sides of every subject, he is really for the *status quo.* There are passages in the book which would lead one to believe that Mr. Wallace thinks there is something about our economic system itself which brings about crises and depressions. But these vague statements are completely offset by his reiterated assertion that our present depression is the result of the World War. It is not Mr. Wallace's bad history, but rather his bad economics that leads him to his counsel of despair. For his hopes are really the result of his despair of doing anything about our political system without upsetting our economic order.

Coming at last to his jurisprudence, the author lays down the law as follows:

> Most lawyers and historians believe that the power (of judicial review) is implied in Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution, and that Marshall, in the famous Marbury case, did no more than state the irrefutable logic of the implication.

This is as nearly the exact reverse of the true situation as a statement of opinion can ever be said to be. No legal historian of any standing now defends the Marshall doctrine and the best of them have shot it to pieces with their criticisms. Logically untenable when it was made in 1803, since then rendered ridiculous by the course of history, Marshall's thesis that any federal system as such necessarily implies the power of judicial review, has been abandoned for at least fifty years, and is now resuscitated by Mr. Wallace only in order to justify the conclusion of his book.

Mr. Brant's book contrasts favorably with Mr. Wallace's in all respects except the conclusion which turns out to be the same as the Secretary's and is in even greater contradiction to the material that precedes it. The author is a past-master of his subject and if he had but left out the last few pages I would be ready to throw my cap in the air and shout for joy, for few books have given me such pleasure in recent years. But the lame conclusion, which one comes upon with a gasp of surprise, has a depressing effect. Mr. Brant shows how the Supreme Court, by all kinds of illogical devices and dodges has whittled down the powers granted to the federal government by the framers of the Constitution. In support of this thesis the author has marshalled an array of facts, the ripe fruit of an eruditon rare in constitutional scholars and illumined by the play of an intellect even rarer.

This makes the lamentable conclusion of the book little less than tragic. Amendment of the Constitution to enlarge the powers of Congress Mr. Brant rejects as a means of dealing with the situation brought about by the Court's bitter resistance to the changing economic order. His reason is that as long as the Court retains the power to declare laws unconstitutional no amendment as to the powers of other branches of the government would be of any avail. The inevitable conclusion of his rejection of relief by amendment is that there must be sufficient means in the Constitution as it stands to remedy the situation—unless, indeed, we should despair of any remedy. But here Mr. Brant proceeds to accept Mr. Wallace's counsel of despair. His conclusion is based on the alleged fact that in the long run the justices of the Supreme Court correctly represent the views of the Presidents who have appointed

RESORTS

TWIN PINES *on* **TROUT LAKE** (Camp Saidel)

Sand beach bathing, boating, fishing, tennis, handball, basketball, baseball, volley ball. Complete social staff—dancing, music and entertainment . . . something doing all the time. Comfortable accommodations at attractive rates ($27.50 and $30.00). For data

S. SAIDEL, LAKE GEORGE, N. Y.

CAMP TAMIMENT, Tamiment, Pa.

● A carnival of gay entertainment, including concerts, cafe floor shows, musical revues, and talking motion pictures under Mac Liebman's direction will be featured every week. Eminent lecturers are presented throughout the summer season by the Rand School of Social Science, for those who are so inclined. Camp will remain open until September 20.

RATES JULY AND AUGUST $29.50 per week ● [De luxe Accommodations Slightly Higher]

Advance Reservations with Deposit
New York Headquarters—7 East 15th Street—Algonquin 4-6875
Philadelphia Headquarters—Reuben E. Cohen, 1240 Widener Bldg. Rittenhouse 3394
All profits from the camp devoted to the Rand School of Social Science.

SCHOOL

● REGISTRATIONS for our Fifteenth Season are now being accepted at our new, low rates of $350-$500 the year—including tuition, dinners and supplies.

BROOKLYN ETHICAL CULTURE SCHOOL
A COEDUCATIONAL DAY SCHOOL
From Kindergarten through the 8th Grade.
49-50 Prospect Park West Brooklyn, N. Y.
Tel. SOuth 8-4300

MOVING? If you are a *Nation* subscriber, please give us three weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new. Write *The Nation,* 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. Ergo, let us pray for good Presidents who will appoint good justices. But Jackson was one of our best Presidents and Taney one of our best judges, yet his appointment led to the worst decision ever rendered by the Supreme Court. Mr. Brant has himself shown conclusively in the preceding portion of the book that Presidential appointment is no protection in great emergencies. And it is the emergencies that count if we are to progress peacefully and avoid bloody revolution.

LOUIS B. BOUDIN

Literary Cartoons

PEOPLE ARE FASCINATING. By Sally Benson. Covici-Friede. $2.50.

THE FIVE-MINUTE GIRL AND OTHER STORIES. By Mary Hastings Bradley. Appleton-Century. $2.50.

MOST of the stories in Mrs. Benson's volume have appeared previously in the *New Yorker*. They are brief satirical sketches of the sort of ridiculous women whom Helen Hokinson and her colleagues have made familiar. They form, like the opera, a hybrid genre best described as the literary cartoon. The characters are poor sillies who expose their shallowness, vanity, hypocrisy, and self-deception through their untiring indulgence in hopelessly trivial conversation and gauche attitudes. Pencil portraits of this kind are usually described as witty and sophisticated, written, as the blurb would convince us, with "quiet malice and shrewd venom." But this impression, which escapes revision when the sketches are separated by periodical publication, seems unjust when the collection is read at a sitting.

Read as a group (there are over sixty in this book) they are seen as mechanical reiterations of a clever formula. The wit has become trickery, the sophistication synthetic; the tired reader calls for a caricaturist with a new brush. This is also true of Mrs. Bradley's stories, several of which are concerned with the psychic contact between the dancers on the floor and the privileged pickers on the stag line. In the title story, Judy's life revolves around the question of her popularity at a coming-out party. Her ambition is to be a five-minute girl, who will be tapped by twelve partners every hour. This story, which was included in the O. Henry Memorial Award Book of prize short stories, is a moderately successful portrait of distorted values in debutante circles. But when the theme is reasserted in "Show Window" and when it becomes clear that the life of no character will rise to a higher level of complexity, we are driven to the difficult conclusion that Mrs. Bradley's imaginative life is confined to the skin-deep.

SAMUEL SILLEN

ART

"HOW I envy you the pleasure you have in dashing off those little poems in your spare hours!" said one of the Rothschilds to Heinrich Heine. Doubtless it is to the poet that we are indebted for preserving the remark; it needed Heine's self-consciousness, his love and his anger, to seize the gem and press it into his forehead.

Contemporaries—and peers—of Heine are shown us in profusion at the Metropolitan Museum's exhibition of "Romanticism in Prints," the "small" works which Baron de Rothschild would have thought the artists did in *their* spare time. At the Museum of Modern Art is a no less remarkable showing of *éditions de luxe* illustrated by original etchings, lithographs, and wood engravings. If we are occasionally tempted to view our time with discouragement surely there is reason to take heart again at the wealth of talent that is here assembled. It is furthermore significant that publishers and artists are willing to make the venture represented by these costly volumes, and that an American city has created a museum to house the production of these men while they are still living.

It is with new pride that we realize that all the prints here are drawn from the collection of the museum itself—as are the graphic masterpieces of all periods which fill an adjoining gallery. One might have thought it necessary to visit the cabinets of Berlin or Dresden to see those contemporaries of Heine who were also his compatriots (Hitler permitting)—Ludwig Richter, Rethel, Lucas, and Caspar David Friedrich. If they are not of the stature of Heine himself or of the German romanticists of music, it must be a snobbish visitor indeed who would refuse to take delight in their visions of childhood, of rustic scenery, and of lovers. Admitting that the names I have mentioned grow pale beside those of Dürer and Holbein, the same devotion to craftmanship is here, and with it a specifically German quality, kindly in its very excess of sentiment, which it is well to have recalled to us today.

The English also are represented by an admirable group of men too little known, even in the case of Bonington, whose extraordinary talent needed less than the twenty-seven years of his life to become an influence on the giants of France. And here are members of the landscape school which, if it produced painters of world-fame like Constable and Turner, had a Girtin and a Cozens too, and many another of charming quality, to whom one returns with apologies that the words "minor artist" were ever spoken in a patronizing tone.

But, after all, contact with art demands discrimination between lesser and greater things. When one reaches Delacroix in this exhibition, one understands why Renoir called him the greatest artist of France—and our glorious contemporary was not forgetting Poussin and Watteau. With Géricault, it is nothing less than the thunder of Michelangelo that rumbles again. To have displayed in full the immensity achieved by French romanticism, the museum would have needed to draw on its treasures of Barye and Corot; perhaps it was a conscious reticence which prevented that, perhaps a desire to give the space to such pictures by less-known men as Gigoux, whose "Clair Obscur," you will find captivating.

But find it—which is to say, go to the show: one day when I was there—a hot day, to be sure, but both exhibitions last until September—I was the only visitor in the gallery. That seems to speak ill for New York. Surely we do not want to play the Rothschild, and treat these prints as the pleasant diversions of leisure. Otherwise we shall merit such scorn as that of Dégas—so much like Heine in his pitiless search for the right line—who echoed the mocking laugh of the German poet in the remark he made when told that his "Danseuses à la Barre" (now in the Metropolitan) had brought nearly half a million francs at auction. "Yes," he said, "I am the horse that wins the *grand prix.*" He was not bitter that the money went to the owner of the horse (he had sold the picture for a tiny fraction of the price, years before). He was not bitter at all. How could he be, after eighty years as an artist? He merely had his little joke about the people who had missed the sport of kings. The Pierpont Morgans, the Altmans, the Havemeyers, all come to see it as that, sooner or later. But the artists—and a few other art-lovers—enjoy it all their lives.

WALTER PACH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

FIGHTING THE DROUGHT

Dear Sirs: Your editorial in the issue of July 11 on the subject of Drought in the Prairie States is misleading to say the least.

Having lived in Central Nebraska for over fifty years, I realize that the drought of 1934 and the present drought of 1936 are something new. These droughts are greater in extent and are characterized by hot spells of longer duration than those of the late eighties and early nineties.

The proposal of the late Elwood Mead to evacuate a large proportion of arid land farmers and resettle them on land where they could make a living is common sense. As a matter of fact, however, the removal of less than 200,000 families would vacate all of the lands which can strictly be classified as marginal lands, whereas the late droughts cover the states of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Wyoming, Montana, parts of Minnesota and Iowa, a territory affecting some 6,000,000 people. It is obvious that moving out the affected people is not the solution.

For the past fifty years, under the system of rugged individualism, without plan or leadership, the tendency has been to drain off the rainfall. Large areas of sloughs and swamps have been drained. During the road-building period in the past fifteen years, the road-building engineers have looked well to the drainage phase. As a result our rains have been drained off by the quickest possible routes. Histories will show that in other parts of the world men have made deserts by substantially the same processes we have been following. In 1934 the Administration undertook on a small scale the construction of dams on farms. Engineers in charge of this work were generally in agreement that their activities were fruitful and deplored the fact that such work was not more extensive. A right-about-face involving the storage of water at every possible point together with the terracing of land is the solution. If any criticism is due the Administration it is that activity in this line has been too meager.

It may be of interest to you to know that in 1934, fields that were irrigated and had plenty of moisture failed or partly failed. The devastating agency is not only drought but the heat which destroys plant production if it comes at a critical time of pollenization. If there is any solution to the heat phase it is stored water which serves to cool the air.

M. E. POYER

Grand Island, Neb., July 14

[We have no difference with our correspondent worth quarreling about. We share his view that everything practicable should be done to prevent the catastrophic run-off of rains not only in the arid regions but throughout the country. What we hope for—and fear we will not get in a Presidential year—is just as systematic, continuous, and rational grappling with the problems of the high prairie as we have in the TVA. We do not accept our correspondent's theory that the drought itself is the result of man's action, or that man's action will materially affect the alternation of dry periods and wet. We call his attention to the fact that there is an unprecedented drought also in the Southeastern states, where nothing new is imputable to man's action. What we need is a policy that aims at the best possible adaptation of economic life to a physical situation we cannot materially modify.—Editors *The Nation.*]

THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION

Dear Sirs: The Nation's comments, in the issue of June 17, on the new Soviet constitution tempt me to charge its editors with the most heinous crime in the intellectual calendar—they argue undialectically. Translated, that means, in this context, that they ignore considerations of time and space.

For instance, they seem to regret that the new constitution abolishes occupational representation and introduces geographical representation. Occupational representation (voting by factories, offices, and so on), was the basis of the Soviet system. It enabled the workers to predominate in government councils. When the workers were the only loyal class this was essential. But time has canceled this necessity. The presumption of the new constitution is that the whole nation is loyal. I think this is the fact. The proletariat no longer need to have a monopoly of control to insure against the hostile pressure of the peasants or the indifference and occasional sabbotage of the intelligentsia. Why then retain what may yet be required in other countries but has lost its usefulness in the U.S.S.R.? You seem to be worried that the bolsheviks are not taking sufficient care of the revolution.

A second example of time-less thinking is the suggestion that I am guilty of "a most un-Marxian statement" when I declare that the Soviet "government cannot disappear . . . perhaps . . . the party will." To be Marxian is to be realistic. Some day the Soviet government may wither away. But not tomorrow. It is good socialist theory but it is not practical to speak of the disappearance of the Soviet state. One of the ultimate implications of the new democracy, however, is the disappearance of the present Communist Party of the Soviet Union. That does not signify that the government stays on forever. It may die too. But if anything goes first it will be the party. This is nothing to be frightened about. The Soviet Union is not America or France or Spain. It has had its revolution. What is applicable to it is not applicable elsewhere.

Then, finally, you discover a terrible inconsistency in my article on the constitution. "In one place," you write, "Mr. Fischer declares that a dictatorship exists whenever there are several classes; in another he speaks of a bloc of democratic, anti-Fascist states—which includes the U.S.S.R., England, France, and Czecho-Slovakia." The contradiction you see is this—there are several classes in England. Therefore England is a dictatorship. Yet I say England is democratic. It is important here, as elsewhere, for political thinkers to distinguish carefully between two things that bear the same name. In England, the capitalist class dictates. Yet the people enjoy many democratic rights. In France, the capitalist class dictates. But a Socialist cabinet is in office. Its effectiveness is limited, but it has already achieved much. Are the dictatorships of England and France different from the German? Of course they are. The German dictatorship precludes all democratic forms and privileges. The French, British, and Czech

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

systems do not. That is occasionally reflected in their foreign policies, and it was with reference to foreign policy that I made the statement which *The Nation* misunderstood. The Soviet example is a further illustration that dictatorship and democracy are not mutually exclusive. You, in fact, say in your editorial that the "Soviet system has always contained more genuine democracy than outsiders have realized." Correct. Yet it was a dictatorship. The new constitution narrows the dictatorship and broadens the democracy. That will strengthen the entente with democratic France. Democracy in Russia was not unrelated to the United front in France. A socialist government in France facilitates the rapprochement with socialist Russia. If, in addition, there were a clearer realization in England of the intimate connection between domestic and foreign policies there might result a strong democratic, anti-fascist front which could ensure peace to Europe. That is what I said in my article.

LOUIS FISCHER

Moscow, July 10

TERROR IN CALIFORNIA

Dear Sirs: Terror against the striking citrus pickers of Orange County, California, by police vigilantes and 500 deputies ordered by Sheriff Jackson to shoot to kill has been intensified. The growers are becoming frantic at the heroic resistance of the strikers. They are attempting to starve the strikers into submission. There is desperate need of assistance. Funds for strike relief and for the defense committee should be sent in care of the Non-Partisian Labor Defense, Room 321, 124 Sixth Street.

WILLIAM VELARDE, *President*
Federation of Agricultural
Workers Union

Los Angeles, July 16

HARVARD REBELS

Dear Sirs: Your editorial in the issue of June 10 on the failure of Harvard University to nominate a candidate for an honorary degree from the Soviet Union fails in quite characteristic fashion to include the possibility that none was available. I should like very much for you to suggest a Russian scientist, now living within the Soviet Union, of equal scientific achievement and academic standing to those on Harvard's list. If Pavlov were alive—but who else?

SAUL WERNER

New York, July 2

Dear Sirs: Your editorial comment in *The Nation* of June 10 intimates that Harvard University has not invited any of the universities or scholars of the Soviet Union to its Tercentenary celebrations. Actually I find that six institutions of learning in the U.S.S.R. were invited to send delegates to Harvard, and, if you so desire, I can furnish you with their names. Professor Pavlov was also invited to receive an honorary degree at Harvard, but unfortunately died in the meantime.

WM. O. FIELD, JR.

New York, July 5

[In our issue of June 10, we noted that Harvard had not seen fit to choose a Soviet scholar as a recipient for any one of the sixty honorary degrees which the University will confer at its tercentenary celebrations. We are glad to have Mr. Field's information that Harvard did invite the Soviet Union to be represented by six delegates, although we believe that the attempt to promote cultural relations between the two countries would have been greatly enhanced if Harvard had taken the further step of including one or more Soviet scientists in its list of those receiving honorary degrees. In the case of Mr. Werner, who apparently believes that there is no Russian worthy of a Harvard degree, the editors are given that rare and pleasant opportunity to educate a reader. We are delighted to comply with Mr. Werner's request that we suggest a deserving Soviet scientist; and in fact we will go farther and suggest seven: A. F. Joffe, physicist; O. Y. Schmidt, who led the far-famed expedition to the Arctic; N. I. Bukharin, sociologist; V. V. Ossinsky, economist; Deborin, philosopher; all members of the Academy, and Professors A. D. Speransky, and A. P. Pinkevitch, physiologist and educator respectively.—Editors *The Nation.*]

CONTRIBUTORS

BENJAMIN STOLBERG, one of the country's leading free-lance journalists, contributes to this issue another of his vivid biographical studies of significant Americans. Previous articles portrayed Huey Long and Governor Talmadge, and more recently Mr. Stolberg wrote "The Jew and the World," which evoked a highly controversial response from our readers. With Warren Vinton, Mr. Stolberg is co-author of "The Economic Consequences of the New Deal."

LOUIS F. GITTLER is an American who has spent the past year in Berlin gathering material for a series of sketches of life in the Third Reich and for a study of the Nazi propaganda technique.

JAMES RORTY concludes in this issue his series on medical politics in the United States. Formerly an advertising man, Mr. Rorty wrote the inside story of advertising in his book, "Our Master's Voice." He is the author also of "Where Life is Better," the record of an unsentimental journey across America.

LEWIS COREY is the author of "The Decline of American Capitalism," "The House of Morgan," and "The Crisis of the Middle Class." Chapters from the latter book appeared originally as a series in *The Nation.*

LOUIS B. BOUDIN, member of the United States Supreme Court bar, is a labor lawyer whose book, "Government by Judiciary," represents one of the most original and important of recent studies in the field of constitutional law.

JOSEPH BARNES, now on the editorial staff of the *Herald Tribune,* worked for two years in the Soviet Union; he later became Secretary of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, in which capacity he traveled widely in the Far East.

BARBARA WOOTTON is an English economist whose recent book, "Plan or No Plan," has evoked wide interest among advocates of economic planning.

SAMUEL SILLEN is a member of the English faculty of New York University, Washington Square Branch, and has contributed reviews to various journals.

WALTER PACH, painter and art critic, is author of "The Masters of Modern Art," "Ananias, or the False Artist," and a critical study of Vincent Van Gogh.

HUGO GELLERT is a well known illustrator who has contributed to the *New Yorker,* the *New Masses,* and other periodicals. Among his best known work is a book of lithographs illustrating excerpts from "Das Kapital."

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION. Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Canadian: 50 cents a year additional. Foreign: $1 a year additional. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Three weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for subscriber's change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED